THE DATE AND AUTHOR
OF THE
SATYRICON

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
W. DEN BOER • W. J. VERDENIUS • R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM SEXTUM DECIMUM

K. F. C. ROSE

THE DATE AND AUTHOR OF THE SATYRICON

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1971

THE DATE AND AUTHOR OF THE SATYRICON

BY

K. F. C. ROSE †

With an Introduction by

J. P. SULLIVAN

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1971

Copyright 1971 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

COLLEGII EXONIENSIS
RECTORI
SOCIISQUE
ALUMNUS
HAUD INGRATUS

CONTENTS

Introduction ix

Abbreviations xiii

I. The Petronian Question and the Neronian Date 1
- 1. Preliminary Considerations 1
- 2. Some Modern Suggestions 8
- 3. Objections to the First Century Dating 9
- 4. Internal Evidence for the Neronian Date 20
- 5. Names in the *Satyricon* 21
- 6. Imperial Events and Personages 24
- 7. Daily Life and Antiquities 27
- 8. Society in the *Satyricon* 30
- 9. The Legal Background of the *Satyricon* 33

II. The Identity of Petronius 38
- 1. Is Petronius Arbiter Nero's Arbiter? 38
- 2. Objections to the Identification. 43
- 3. Petronius' *praenomen* and *cognomen* 47
- 4. Petronius' Career 55

III. Petronius and his Literary Contemporaries 61
- 1. Petronius and Lucan 61
- 2. Petronius and Seneca 69

IV. Petronius and Neronian Society 75
- 1. Allusions to Events of 60—65 A.D. 75
- 2. Allusions to the Emperor 77
- 3. Other Imperial and Contemporary References . . . 79

Appendix A: Alleged Allusions to Nero in the *Satyricon* . . 82

Appendix B: Petronius' Adaptations of Lucan 87

Bibliography 95

Indexes 102

INTRODUCTION

Progress in Petronian studies has been continually hampered by a curious and sometimes ill-informed reluctance on the part of many scholars to accept the traditional date of the *Satyricon* and the identification of its author with the Neronian courtier Petronius, whose career and death are so vividly described by Tacitus (*Annals* 16.17-9). Since the date has been given (and variously accepted) as any time from the reign of Augustus to the middle of the third century A.D., what critic or scholar who had not thoroughly examined the complicated and muddied controversy for himself could venture to pronounce with confidence on the other important aspects of the work? As a consequence Petronian research has tended until recently to limit itself to piecemeal assaults on the historical problems, or to textual emendation and exegesis.

The *Satyricon* is of course an original and, for us, untypical work; furthermore, because of the fragmentary state of the text, it presents more problems than the other literature of the "Silver Age". Nevertheless, the correct dating of the work was suggested as early as 1571 by Scaliger and was strongly argued in 1811 by Cataldo Iannelli. Since then a number of minor but significant pieces of historical and archaeological evidence in support of this date has been adduced. Unfortunately, these accumulations to the solid evidence of Iannelli were swamped by the far greater number of mistaken arguments offered by those who disagreed with the Neronian date, even though they were by no means unanimous about the date that was to be preferred. The doubt and confusion over the matter came to a head with the publication in 1948 of E.V. Marmorale's *La questione petroniana*, an ill-advised palinode to that author's earlier book on the subject in 1937, in which he had hewed to more traditional lines. This in itself would be no indication of general confusion were it not that out of eighteen scholarly reviewers of Marmorale's book, three were convinced by its thesis, ten had little significant comment to make, and only five offered convincing objections.

The present work by the late Professor Rose is therefore both opportune and necessary for a number of reasons. He has examined, with relentless patience and thoroughness, both the traditional and more recent arguments for and against the Neronian dating, and, in so doing, he has applied to the problem recent historical and archaeological research unavailable to Iannelli. In particular, the literary evidence Rose brings to bear not only helps to prove the traditional dating with far greater precision than hitherto, but serves also to place the *Satyricon* in its social and literary context; this adds a great deal to our understanding and appreciation of the aims and methods of the work. Petronius may now be seen, not as some undateable freak of genius, but as the consular Titus Petronius Niger, a talented member of Nero's literary circle, which had included the younger Seneca and Lucan, a coterie which was often involved in a conflict of literary and philosophical principles.

In sum, Professor Rose, by re-establishing, once and (I trust) for all, the correct dating and attribution of the *Satyricon*, has not only cleared the ground for the more important literary evaluation of an accepted, if sometimes clandestine, classic, but he has provided also substantial foundations upon which future research may build.

The death of Kenneth Rose on October 28th 1967 at the early age of 29 was a grievous loss to me personally and to all his friends and colleagues in Europe and America. He was a scholar of early promise, a popular teacher, and a devoted friend. After taking his undergraduate and graduate degrees at Exeter College, Oxford, where he had been a Senior Scholar and Senior Student, he taught for some years at Kent School, Connecticut, and the University of Rochester, before joining the department of Classics at the University of Texas. There he gave generously of his time and abundant energy to his students, to the work of the department, and to its classical journal *Arion*. Partly because of this, the revision of the manuscript of the present work, originally an Oxford thesis, had scarcely begun. In completing the editing of it, however, I have been greatly aided by his extensive notes and annotations. He clearly intended to shorten the work by omitting or summarising material which he had published elsewhere, and also to add references to the relevant literature that had appeared since 1962. I have tried to carry out these intentions as far as possible. Various appendixes as well as later annotations have been absorbed into the text, and some interesting but irrelevant matter has been excluded. I have taken the editorial liberty of removing a few inadvertent stylistic blemishes and adding a few additional references and notes (which appear within square brackets). With the help of Professor Gareth Schmeling, I have also brought the bibliography up to date.

For his useful advice on the editing and for reading through the MS I am grateful to Mr. J. G. Griffith, who succeeded me as official supervisor of the author's research at Oxford in 1961, and Mr. Oswyn Murray. The author himself wished to acknowledge also the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, especially Mr. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, for their early assistance and generosity; Mr. E. J. Kenney and Professor R. G. M. Nisbet for their helpful criticism; and Professors Gilbert Bagnani and Ronald Syme for their valuable suggestions.

J. P. SULLIVAN

State University of New York
at Buffalo

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals are referred to by their abbreviations in *L'Année Philologique*; other abbreviations and references to classical authors follow the established forms. References to Burman's two editions of Petronius (1709, 1743) are given by a double number, e.g. 221/297. The works of the early commentators such as de Valois and Statileo are in the second volume of these editions. Chapters and subsections of the *Satyricon* are denoted by Arabic numerals, e.g. 5, 6.1 etc. The MSS of Petronius are denoted by the sigla used by Müller; fragment numbers follow Müller up to number 30, after which they follow Ernout's edition, since Müller does not include them. The commentaries on Lucan of Lejay, Getty and Haskins are referred to by page reference only. The following abbreviations may be noted:

ASPN	*Archivio storico p.l. provincie napolitane.*
Bagnani, *AE*	G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance* (1954).
BC	The *Bellum Civile* in chapters 119-24 of the *Satyricon.*
Beck	C. Beck, *The Age of Petronius Arbiter* (1856).
Bücheler	F. Bücheler, *Petronii Satirae* (1862).
BursianJ	*Jahresbericht. u.d. kl. Altertumswiss.* (ed. Bursian).
Collignon, *Étude*	A. Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone* (1892).
Dousa	Jan van der Does, *Praecidanea* (1583).
Ernout	A. Ernout, *Pétrone, le Satiricon*^{4} (1958).
FleckeisenJ	*Jahrbücher f. Philologie,* &c. (ed. Fleckeisen)
Friedländer	L. Friedländer, *Cena Trimalchionis*^{2} (1906).
Gaselee, *Materials*	S. Gaselee, *Materials for an Edition of Petronius* (unpubl. 1908).
Iannelli	C. Iannelli, *In Perottinum codicem* (1811).
IRT	*Inscriptiones romanae Tripolitaniae.*
Maiuri, *Cena*	A. Maiuri, *La Cena di Trimalchione* (1945).
Marmorale, *PT*	E.V. Marmorale, *Petronio nel suo tempo* (1937).
Marmorale, *QP*	E. V. Marmorale, *La questione petroniana* (1948).
Müller	K. Müller, *Petronii Satyricon* (1961).
Müller^2	K. Müller, *Petronius Satyrica* (1965).
Paratore, 1933	E. Paratore, *Il Satyricon di Petronio* (1933).
Paratore, 1961	E. Paratore, *La narrativa latina nell'éta di Nerone*^{2} (1961).
RIC	*Roman Imperial Coinage* (ed. Mattingly and Sydenham).
Rini	A. Rini, *Petronius in Italy* (1937).
Schnur	H. C. Schnur, *The Age of Petronius Arbiter* (1957).
SEHRE	M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History the Roman Empire* (2nd edition, 1957).
Studer	G. Studer, *RhM* n.f. 2 (1843) 50ff, 202ff.
TBS	*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society.*
TH	The *Troiae Halosis* poem in chapter 89 of Petronius.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PETRONIAN QUESTION AND THE NERONIAN DATE

1. Preliminary Considerations

The Petronian Question consists of the following basic problems: was the *Satyricon* written during the age of Nero? If so, was it written by the Petronius who was known as the Emperor's Arbiter of Elegance? Or was it written during the reign of some other emperor, and if so, by whom? This question has been fought over perhaps more than any other in Latin literature; and its resolution is essential before the larger literary aspects of the *Satyricon* can be properly evaluated.

An obvious premiss must be invoked: that what we possess of the text of the *Satyricon* in the MSS groups *O, L* and *H* is, apart from minor glosses and interpolations, the work of one man known in the MS tradition, almost without exception, as "Petronius Arbiter". To doubt this is to exceed the limits of reasonable scepticism.

The title of the *Satyricon* has been disputed mainly on the evidence of unreliable mediaeval manuscripts. Our earliest witness is Marius Victorinus (fl. 350 A.D.) who gives the spelling *Satyricon* (*GLK* 6.143). This title is perfectly appropriate, being an abbreviated form for *Satyricon libri*—books of indecent (satyr-like) adventures. The *-icon* ending is common in Latin literature; it is the genitive plural of a Greek title with *libri* understood, as in Vergil's *Georgicon,* Lucan's *Iliacon,* Manilius' *Astronomicon.*

The spelling *Satyricon* is generally found in the MSS of the *L*-class, as represented by the editions of Pithoeus and Tornaesius and Daniel Rogers' Lambeth MS (*r*). It is found also in two inferior MSS of the *O*-class, *D* and *G*; *B,* the oldest MS of this class, has the title *Satiricon*—but the variant spelling is of no real significance. In the twelfth century Petronius' work was associated with *satura* (*satira*) as can be seen from the titles of the two MSS of that time, *R* and *P*. The former has *excerta Petronii Satirici,* and the latter *satirarum libri,* to which a later hand has added in the margin *Petronii Arbitri Affranii Satirici liber.* The added name Afranius derives from a confusion with the republican poet of that name who was censured for his *foedi puerorum amores*, and Scaliger included the name in his MS copy,[1] having found it in the lost Bituricus, a descendant of *P*. The epithet *Satiricus* has been corrupted to *Satyrus* in the inscriptio of *A*.

Bücheler's authority caused many to follow him in believing the title to be *Satirae*; but this does not explain how a simple and everyday title could be corrupted to *Satyricon*. Ullman supposed that the error originated with Heiric of Auxerre or some pupil of his (Auxerre appears to have been the "home" of the Petronius text in the mid-ninth century), which would be a fair hypothesis if it could explain Victorinus' title *Satyricon*, which Ullman does not mention.

Sage in his edition compromised by believing the "best" MS and accepting the spelling *Satiricon*, which would then have to represent a low pun on Petronius' part, between *Satira* and *Satyrica*. In this case Victorinus would be foolishly "emending" a pun; and Sage appears rather optimistic in assuming that such a feeble pun could have survived the hazards of copyists for eight centuries. In any case, the authority of the Bernensis is nothing compared to that of Victorinus, half a millenium earlier.

Much of the preference for spelling *Satiricon* derives simply from the rarity of the letter *y* in French and Italian; consequently Ernout in his edition accepts this spelling as "traditional in France", although on the same page (xxxviii, n.3) he quotes Victorinus with the spelling *Satyricon*. Other nations have preferred pedantry: Highet writes *Satirica* and Hahn urges the title *Satyrics*, on the analogy of Vergil's *Georgics*.[2]

A further point of importance for the understanding of the *Satyricon* is the evidence for its original size. It is clear from internal evidence that many lengthy adventures have been lost from the MS tradition, and this is confirmed by the Traguriensis (*A* and *H*), which states that the *vulgaria excerpta* (i.e. the *O*-text) are from books 15 and 16. Poggio had found a MS of book 15 of Petronius (cf. Müller [2] 402-11) which contained the *Cena.* It is clear that the scribe of the Traguriensis, seeing a large amount of *O*-text after the *Cena* episode, guessed that what came after the *Cena* was book 16. Another piece of evidence is a mediaeval interpolation in the text of Fulgentius (*Myth.* 3.8), found only in a MS of the eleventh century, Paris. 7975, fol. 82r, which states that the text of 20.17, in a fuller form, comes from book 14. This is not at variance with the evidence of the Traguriensis, whose scribe seems merely to have guessed at the extent of books 15 and 16. Finally, a ninth-century lexicon from Fleury (described by its discoverer, see Müller [2], 405 n. 29) attributes a phrase from 89.1 to book 15. This suggests that the *Cena* MS found by Poggio was indeed of book 15, but not all of it. The book-divisions are of considerable antiquity and are attested from three independent sources; they cannot be set aside on a priori grounds.

---

[1] Jean de Montreuil (1354-1418) *Ep.* 14 quotes some lines of the *BC*, adding *ut inquiit Aufranius*. The Berne *Scholia* on Vergil, *Georg.* 2.98 cite the occurrence of the form *vinus*, *aput Franium in Satyria*.

[2] See F. Bücheler, *Kl.Schr.* I (1915), 428; B. L. Ullman, *SPh* 18 (1920), 400; O. Immisch, *NJKA* 47(1921), 419 n. 1; R. Reitzenstein, *SHAW* 14 (1923), 30ff; B.E. Perry, *CP* 20(1925), 31ff; E.A. Hahn, *CW* 53 (1959), 54; G. Highet, *TAPA* 72 (1941), 176, n. 1. The best discussion is that of W. Heraeus, *Kl. Schr.* (1937), 108f, [until, most recently, G. Brugnoli, *RCCM* 3(1961), 317ff, and C. A. Van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (1965), 154f.]

Many scholars have, in point of fact, rejected the book-numbers. They may be commended for refusing to believe that sixteen large books of licentious humour could have been produced by one man; but the present age has seen the publication of monster works of this sort—*The* 120 *Days of Sodom, My Secret Life*—nor should we forget Vorberg, and the absurd Frank Harris. And Petronius does not devote all that much of the extant narrative to pornographic subjects. Even if book 15 extended from chapter 1 to 99, as Bücheler suggested, and the lacuna were filled up, then sixteen books of the Satyricon could easily have been printed in ten average-size Budé volumes, and would be hardly longer than *Tom Jones.*[1]

Modern parallels and the evidence of the *Satyricon* itself suggest that the evidence for the book-division is to be accepted. We have the barest hints of full-scale adventures in the lost portion of the narrative: two episodes in Massilia and one in Naples; complicated adventures with Lichas and with Tryphaena; a scandal revolving round some sacred objects of Isis and another concerning the seduction of Lichas' wife; a court case; adventures involving Encolpius in the arena, a theft of some gold pieces, and a temple-robbery; perhaps an episode in Egypt; encounters with unknown ladies named Doris and Albucia. Most of these we learn of by chance; there could have been many more.[1]

---

[1] [For further parallels, see now J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius A Literary Study* (1968), 34 ff.]

Some scholars have divined that at chapter 141 we are drawing towards the end of the *Satyricon*. But all that seems foreshadowed at this point is the imminent escape of Encolpius and Giton from Croton: Eumolpus probably drops out of the narrative, but there are other characters who could reappear, just as Lichas did. There is, of course, no means of telling whether Petronius lived to write more or not—this question depends upon whether the precise date of composition for our remaining fragments can be determined.

These preliminary arguments, then, should have established that the *Satyricon* of Petronius Arbiter (as *literary* tradition knows him almost without exception) was a very substantial work in its original form, considerably longer than the average British (as opposed to American) novel of today; and that its title suggests the sexual adventures and involvements of immoral or amoral characters.

The uncertainty about the date of the *Satyricon* stems in part from the paucity of evidence about the work in antiquity. The earliest testimony is that of Terentianus Maurus (c. 200 A.D.), who quotes some verses of 'Petronius' (fr. 20) and also refers to him as *arbiter disertus*. The usual appellation is 'Petronius' (frr. 1-3, 5a, 5b, 6, 8, 10, 14-6, 20, 22-3, 27-7, Sidonius 9.265-7, and also the early 9th century Leiden Voss. Misc. 1), though he is also called 'Arbiter' (frr. 4, 19, 20-1, 24 and Macrob. *Somn.* 1.2.8). The name is given as 'Petronius Arbiter' only by Fulgentius (frr. 7, 9, 11-3, 25-28) and by Lactantius (fr. 27). It is surprising that none of these fragments is represented in the MS tradition; not until Isidorus in the seventh century do we find an allusion to a part of the narrative which has survived the Dark Ages. This might suggest that the *Satyricon* was a very large work, although an explanation might be that some of our ancient testimonia refer to another work by Petronius or by another man of the same name.

The *Satyricon* is first mentioned by Victorinus (c. 350 A.D.). It is possible that Johannes Lydus knew of this title also, since he has a very ill-informed reference to it in connection with the σατυρικὸν νόμον (*de Mag.* 1.41). On the other hand, Fulgentius

---

[1] [On the reconstruction of the *Satyricon*, see V. Ciaffi, *La Struttura del Satyricon* (1955) and Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 38ff.]

(fr. 6) may have thought of the title as *satura*, although his discussion is vague and casual.

Parts of the ancient evidence have been used for dating arguments. Firstly, it has been thought that, since no one refers to Petronius or to the *Satyricon* until about 200 A.D., the work was not written before then. But a similar silence is observed over Velleius Paterculus and Phaedrus, both unquestionably of the first century A.D., and it is not surprising if a work of the nature of the *Satyricon* received no discussion from the serious-minded. The argument from silence can therefore be firmly rejected.

Secondly, it has been thought that Lactantius, in his note on Statius, *Theb.* 3.661 (fr. 27), attributes to Petronius the words *primus in orbe deos fecit timor* (also attributed to Petronius by Fulgentius), with the comment: *ut Lucanus* [*Phars.* 1.486] *'quae finxere timent' et Petronius Arbiter istum secutus 'primus in orbe deos fecit timor'* &c. The obvious meaning is that Lactantius *thought* that Petronius wrote his lines after *Lucan*; some scholars have interpreted the comment to mean that Petronius was imitating *Statius*.

We cannot be certain that Lactantius is right: Lucan's phrase comes from a description of Rome after the news of Caesar's invasion of Italy, whereas the Petronian lines are obviously philosophical and in the style of Lucretius. If Lactantius has bungled this "parallel", he could easily have attributed the poem to the wrong author, as Ernout suggests (*ad loc.*). Thus, even if the poem is by Petronius, it may have been written quite independently of Lucan, and Statius may or may not have known it. If he did, then Petronius wrote before Statius. If he did not, we can prove nothing. All that can be established is, that Lactantius thought that Petronius wrote after Lucan, which is not very helpful since the *BC* abundantly indicates the same conclusion.

Thirdly, St. Jerome (*Ep.* 130.19) attributes to "Arbiter" the line *non bene olet qui bene semper olet* (fr. 24). In Martial we find the same words with *Postume* added to complete the pentameter. If Jerome is wrong to attribute the line to Petronius instead of Martial, then we have no evidence for the date of Petronius. But if Jerome is right, there are three possibilities: either Martial borrowed the phrase from Petronius, or vice versa, or the two writers wrote independently. The first two of these choices are equally possible, taking the question in isolation, and the third rather less. Most scholars have thought from other evidence that Martial wrote after Petronius (cf. especially Dousa's comparison of Martial 3.82 with the *Cena*), but the reverse has been strenuously argued. At this point it is sufficient to show that none of the ancient evidence provides any helpful indication of the date of the *Satyricon*; there is a probable *terminus ante* of 200 A.D. from Terentianus' evidence, but the rest of the testimonia is too fraught with uncertainty and the unreliability of the authors involved for even tentative conclusions. Of this Bücheler, for one, was well aware: on Lactantius he comments (216) *auctoritatem eius non assis facio,* and on Johannes Lydus he opines (xi) *neque . . . satiras ipsas umquam inspexerat.*

Ancient neglect of the *Satyricon* has been amply compensated since the Renaissance. The first opinion concerning the date was expressed by Poggio (*Ep.* 1.7. cited by Müller XI), who dates it on linguistic grounds: *ut conicio, paulo post tempora Augusti.* Rini (14) points out that Poggio read the later books of Tacitus, which include the account of the Arbiter of Elegance, but he never connected the two "Arbiters". Until the edition of Sambucus in 1565 there are few opinions which I have been able to trace. Giraldus († 1552) was uncertain of the date, but favored the reign of the emperor Julian; he mentions that "some scholars" placed Petronius before the times of Quintilian (see 252/194-5 and Rini 38-9). Sambucus, using only the *O*-class text, conjectured that Petronius wrote under the emperor Gallienus (253-68), largely because a Petronius Volusianus was consul in 262 A.D.

In Daniel Rogers' Lambeth MS (r) there is a collection of some of the external evidence discussed above, with the suggestion that Terentianus Maurus was a contemporary of Martial. This, along with the Domitianic references discerned by Pomponius Sabinus (quoted in the *variae lectiones* of Pithoeus' second edition of 1587), at least place Petronius in the first century. The first scholar who seemed aware of the identity of Petronius with the Neronian courtier is Scaliger. As already stated, he compounded the *inscriptio* of his Leiden MS from various sources: the Bituricus, the lost "long" MS of Jacques Cujas, and possibly Sambucus' edition also. In addition, he gives the author the praenomen Gaius, and this he can have obtained only from the Tacitean account. It may well be that Scaliger had heard of this conjecture from one of his many friends who had studied Petronius with

Cujas, but, in default of any evidence for this, the credit for suggesting the identification must rest with him. The Leiden MS was probably written in 1571 or so (see Müller XIVf) and the *inscriptio*, apparently in the same ink as the main text of the MS, would be therefore contemporary with it.

The identification of Petronius with the Tacitean courtier was suggested in print by Patisson, Pithoeus' publisher (254/297), and by Pithoeus himself in his anonymous edition of 1577. In the *editio princeps* of the "long" text two years earlier, the editor Tornaesius was non-committal on the subject. But scepticism was expressed by Justus Lipsius on Tac. *Ann.* 16.18 (1581 p. 473), and by Binetus in 1579. The "orthodox" view of Scaliger and Pithoeus was reinforced by the work of Jan Dousa in his *Praecidanea* (1583), and by most subsequent editors, such as van Wouweren and Goldast (1594, 1610).

It would be a tedious and melancholy task to enumerate the subsequent history and ramifications of the Petronian question. Some highlights may be mentioned: Bourdelot in 1618 dated the *Satyricon* to the reign of Constantine (307-37 A.D.), and also suggested that Petronius was a Gaul. De Salas in 1629 argued with monumental ingenuity that Trimalchio was a satirical portrait of the emperor Nero, and that the *Satyricon* is the catalogue of vices which the courtier sent to Nero after his suicide, in place of flattering *codicilli*. These and other controversies were revived by the discovery and publication (1664) of the codex Traguriensis, which contains the whole *Cena* as well as a fifteenth-century *O*-class text. Wagenseil and Hadrien de Valois condemned the *Cena* MS as a forgery, the former because the forty new chapters did not satirise Nero and de Salas had "proved" from the first ten that they ought to. The latter also raised an issue which caused much subsequent controversy: he argued that the Latin of the *Satyricon* was too barbaric and degenerate to belong to the first century. Much of the argument depended upon textual corruptions, and the ministrations of Heinsius and Scheffer soon provided a much-improved text, but this was to remain a source of error for a long time, at least until it was fully realised that the *Cena* was partly an exercise in realistic characterization.

The eighteenth century was dominated textually by the editions of the elder Burman (1709, 1743), through his contribution to the dating problem was to place the *Satyricon* in the reign of

Claudius, since the times of Nero were too corrupt for anyone to have had enough moral fiber to castigate vices with such power. Ignarra erratically argued that the *Satyricon* was to be placed in Antonine times (see Rini 118-22). Although Iannelli effectively demolished all his arguments (Rini 134-9), Ignarra unfortunately persuaded the industrious La Porte du Theil, whose monumental notes and edition languish unpublished in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Almost all of this work is vitiated by the erroneous dating; and the academic world has reason to be grateful for the political considerations which induced du Theil to destroy practically all the copies of his printed edition.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there have been constant attempts to revive the late date, and many of these were by well-known scholars: Niebuhr, Sogliano, Paoli and Marmorale, to name only a few. Other aberrations have been the revival of de Salas' view in various forms; Beck's Augustan date; Kraffert's Flavian date; and—perhaps more alarming—a widespread and defensive scepticism. Scholarly caution and scepticism are, of course, necessary in the study of classical antiquity; but the *Satyricon* should loom large in any serious critical study of Latin literature, and uncertainty about its date or composition is therefore worth removing. The efflorescence of Latin literature under Nero cannot be properly evaluated if we are not sure whether to include the work of Petronius in it.

2. Some Modern Suggestions

The dating problem has become so complex that scholars have generally been too preoccupied with the approximate date to attempt to determine more precisely the actual date of composition. Usually it has been thought sufficient to give the name of the emperor under whom the *Satyricon* was written, though in some cases the termini suggested have been even more vague. A more precise date of composition is critically relevant, not so much for the whole *Satyricon* as for the various baffling allusions which seem to derive their point from their topicality. If such allusions are to be detected and understood, it is essential that the time of writing be tied down as exactly as possible, since topicality of its very nature soon loses its point, except for the antiquarian reader.

Iannelli realised (314) that Petronius wrote the *BC* after the appearance of at least part of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, and he concluded that Petronius wrote that portion of the *Satyricon* around the year 63 A.D. In this he is followed by Mössler, Baldwin, and Herrmann; it is worth noting, however, that the most thorough of the scholars who have examined the *BC*, Stubbe, is much more vague about the dating implications of Petronius' adaptations of Lucan.

Ussani divined an allusion to the Fire of Rome (July 64) and also insisted that the verses about buried treasure in 128 must have been written before the summer of 65, otherwise Petronius, by possible alluding to the debacle of the lost treasures of Queen Dido, would sound impossibly tactless. One hardly need point out that these same verses have been taken as an deliberate allusion to that same debacle. Thus Paratore gives a date of composition for our fragments as 63-5, and Terzaghi more courageously opts for the years 65-6, accepting the Treasure allusion as valid, and stating that Petronius knew of all of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, though he adds that the *BC* may be a later addition to the work. But neither of these scholars successfully validates the treasure allusion, nor does Terzaghi come anywhere near proving that Petronius knew all of the *Pharsalia*.

Petronius' allusions to Seneca have been much neglected. Maiuri (22) for some reason dates the *Satyricon* to the late 50's because of some Senecan echoes, and Révay provides a *terminus post* of 62-3 from similar material, although this date would seem fairly certain from the Lucan arguments.

Most recently, Bagnani has attempted to date the *Satyricon* to the year 60 or possibly earlier, with the suggestion that Petronius presented it to the world at the Neronia of 60 A.D. He uses one argument alone, which is dealt with in a later chapter; it has gained an incredibly wide acceptance. Cizek in 1965 does little more than re-work Iannelli's date.[1]

3. OBJECTIONS TO THE FIRST CENTURY DATING

In the absence of valid evidence from antiquity, two methods of determining the date of the *Satyricon* can be applied, both using the evidence of the work itself; by dating its language, and by discovering allusions to other Roman writers, personages, customs and general antiquities. It was noted previously that de Valois and others had been impressed by the apparently unclassical Latinity of Petronius, and the linguistic arguments for a late date have recently been presented at great length by Enzo Marmorale in *La questione petroniana.* Since Marmorale's work in this area is the most comprehensive and developed attempt to prove the lateness of Petronius' Latin, its refutation should be sufficient to disprove the work of his predecessors also.

---

[1] [For a fuller, if more light-hearted, account of the scholarly history, see K.F.C.Rose,'The Petronian Inquisition: An Auto-da-Fe', *Arion* 5(1966), 275ff.]

It is curious that such an extensive treatment as Marmorale's should be so coyly qualified; at *QP* 175 we are told that the linguistic argument is merely a "*sussidio*" to the subsequent arguments from allusions; at *QP* 136 Marmorale states that his qualifications for a proper linguistic study are not good; and at *QP* 148 the rather ominous phrase *cum grano salis* appears.

Another disquieting factor is Marmorale's attitude towards the reliability of the transmitted text; and in fact we find that much of his argument depends on MS readings which most scholars have suspected of being corrupt. His edition of the *Cena* (1947) exhibits a remarkable conservatism, which is in striking contrast to such editions as Müller's. But the dichotomy between the "conservative" and the "radical" critic makes their disputes a source of confusion if a suspected MS corruption is to be validated by other means; in the case of Petronius, a late date proven by *other* means would affect one's attitude to presumably "late" spellings and usages in the MSS. For this reason, it is better to examine Marmorale's argument on its own terms, however distressed we may be by the textual procedures shown by Marmorale in such of his notes as those on 33.5 and 44.8.

Marmorale's basic position is that the Latin of the *Satyricon* is uniform and contains too many "late" usages and anomalies to be contemporary with Seneca the Younger; it cannot have been written until Antonine times. He admits that the language of the *Satyricon* does not *look* uniform, but he states that many apparent variations are due to changes of tone (this is not explained) or to the exigencies of character-portrayal. He acknowledges also that some passages imitate classical models. At this point the reader begins to wonder whether these qualifications are at all consistent with the theory of a uniform language, and to this

Marmorale replies that the whole *Satyricon* is written in the same *fondo linguistico,* namely, the *sermo urbanus* of Petronius' day, as spoken by Petronius and other Romans in Rome.

Marmorale might have made some attempt to prove that Petronius' language is that of the city of Rome. Since Petronius gives every appearance of being a realistic writer (within certain limits), and the action of the novel takes place either in Campania or Croton, we might expect that the language given to the provincial characters would be provincial rather than urban. Marmorale admits that Petronius himself is a cultured Roman, which implies that he puts his own cultured Latin into the mouths of vulgar and uncultured south Italians. Marmorale seems to sense this objection, and allows that Petronius gives some of the vulgar speakers genuine rusticisms for reasons of realism—which is one more qualification to his theory of a uniform language. There is another difficulty about the hypothesis that Petronius imitates classical models; it would involve the author in a pointless and anachronistic literary fad. The literary passages are, as Schnur (173) points out, just what we would expect from a writer of correct and elegant Latin in the so-called Silver Age.

At this point it would be as well to state the "orthodox" view of Petronius' Latin: (a) the Latin of Encolpius' narrative and the speech of the better-educated characters such as Eumolpus approximates to the *sermo urbanus* of Petronius' own day, which by the standards of Ciceronian literary Latin has a much slacker syntax and more neologisms, Grecisms, and colloquialisms; (b) the more exalted and literary passages (1-5, 88, 118, etc) are written in a very elegant literary style; (c) the freedmen and slaves speak a more or less barbarous Latin, full of slang and solecisms. Petronius himself indicates that many of them come from the eastern Mediterranean, and so will have learned Latin haphazardly.

It appears that Marmorale admits (b), except that he makes Petronius write anachronistically; he admits (a), but would dispute (c) by emphasizing the identity of the *fondo linguistico* of the speech of all classes. This latter is in one sense true, in that all the characters speak some form of the Latin language! But to have any argument at all, Marmorale must intend the phrase to mean a contemporary *sermo urbanus,* and in the following discussion that will be assumed.

Marmorale takes three passages from the *Satyricon,* 26-30, 97-100, and 102-3, and from these he lists usages which he deems un-classical, vulgar, or colloquial. In all, 43 examples are produced, of which three are merely Greek words, six are probably MSS corruptions, one is from the speech of a slave, and only five are designate as vulgar, plebeian, or rustic. It follows that most of these 43 examples, given proper caution about the text, are perfectly consonant with the *sermo urbanus* of the first century A.D. The result is the same for his attempt (*QP* 172-5) to discern non-classical usages in the speech of Eumolpus. Finally, he takes (*QP* 195-7) a sample of Trimalchio's Latin (75.3-10) and finds 21 examples of "bad" Latin found also in the speech of the better-educated characters. A check shows that eleven of these instances have no proper parallel except in the speech of freedmen or slaves. The others speak for themselves: the use of *parataxis*, and such usages as *propter formam, decem partes dicit, diaria, facere de, concoquere, amasiuncula, suaviter sit, tam magnus* and *lucerna* (in the sense of *oleum*).

It so happens that Marmorale can be refuted from his own commentary on the *Cena*. In this part of the *Satyricon* there is almost exactly the same amount of conversation from the slaves and freedmen as there is narrative and educated speech. For the latter, Marmorale notes in his commentary 41 usages as non-classical. Six of these are almost certainly corrupt; 22 are noted as being merely from the language of everyday speech, with no dating implications; almost all can be paralleled from Seneca the Younger or Pliny's Epistles. Only four vulgarisms are noted: *habebat inscriptum* (30.3), which is hardly vulgar; † *pataracina* † (41.10), *exinterare* (49.4), both of which seem to be echoes of things said by freedmen; and *phaecasiae* (67.4). At the most then there remain nine possible instances of colloquial, late, unclassical (or whatever) Latin.

Examination of Marmorale's notes on the speech of the slaves and freedmen produces 154 noted instances of solecisms, vulgarisms, rusticisms, and plebeian usages, omitting the scores of places where the usage is attributed merely to everyday speech. Some thirty of these occur more than once, and, if Marmorale had not so cherished the readings of the Traguriensis, he might have avoided some twenty more. But even on the most lenient count, the proportion of instances of arguably "later" Latin in the speech of the two classes is ninety to seven. So much for the uniformity of language.

The point need not be labored. Marmorale's work can serve as a reminder that the narrative of the *Satyricon* is not written in the style of Cicero's speeches or, to a lesser degree, the essays of the younger Seneca. The various major errors which Marmorale perpetrates need not be catalogued here. He does however show that the extravagant claims to date the *Satyricon* to the first century simply on linguistic grounds were not justified. Nonetheless, the elegance of the literary passages might suggest the first century rather then the third, and it would seem probable that Encolpius' narrative is more slangy and casual than that habitually spoken by its creator. But we do not have enough evidence about conversational Latin to construct a sound argument. One example might be adduced, the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca, which uses many apparently conversational phrases and words to be found also in Petronius, as was observed by Collignon, Maiuri, and Bagnani.[1] It is tempting to suppose that many of these phrases dropped out of fashion quite quickly. On the other hand, there is no need to spend time on the bizarre hypothesis that Petronius wrote a work in various styles of first-century Latin at a much later date.

In 1875 von Guericke pointed out some affinities between the freedmen's slang and certain wall-scribblings from Pompeii, all of which of course date to before 79 A.D. This work has since been extended and corrected[2]; but the possibility that vulgar Latin did not greatly change for the next few centuries must be reckoned with. Therefore the Pompeian *graffiti* show only that the speech of Trimalchio and his friends is *consonant* with the first century A.D.

Marmorale (*QP* 142) raises the point that Latin literature was traditionalist, at least until Apuleius, and therefore the "untraditional" Petronius must be dated later. But Marmorale, apart from forgetting certain elements of logic at this point, himself acknowledges that Lucan broke with tradition: and Petronius specifically points out (132.15) that the *Satyricon* is *novae simplicitatis opus*, a departure from the canons of the high-minded and serious literary tradition. It is this very claim to unorthodoxy and novelty which should make us cautious about dating the work from its style and literary affinities (or the lack of them).

---

[1] The best collection of parallels and earlier references may be found in Bagnani, *AE* 80-2.

[2] A. von Guericke, *De linguae vulgaris reliquiis*, &c. (1875); well supplemented by F. C. Wick, *AAN* 23 (1905), 229f; see also V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*^{2} (1958), Maiuri, *Cena* 227-35.

Marmorale also enlists some metrical and rhythmical points in support of his thesis. He notes (*QP* 292-3) two presumed instances of false quantity which might imply that Petronius wrote after the time when Roman poets were insenitive to quantity:

artis severae si quis †amat† effectus (5.1)
et pictis anas †renovata† pinnis. (93.2.4)

So the MSS, although for *amat* Tornaesius and Scaliger respectively conjecture *ambit* and *hamat*. But Petronius shows such versatility with difficult metres, and elsewhere such excellent prosody, that it is rather perverse to cite a mere two instances out of so many hundred; and Marmorale says nothing about the unmetrical verses in 23 and 132.15.7, convincingly corrected by Fraenkel and Canterus respectively.

QP 247-74 contains an elaborate attempt to show that Petronius wrote after Apuleius, Fronto, and Aurelius, by adducing tenuous parallel passages and insisting that Petronius is the later writer in each instance. Suffice it to say that this argument has even less strength than the linguistic. The curious reader may find the details competently dealt with by others.[1]

Finally, Marmorale (*QP* 293-6) notes some passages which C. U. Clark thought contained *clausulae* of a type associated with later Latin. Marmorale's illustration of this principle (*QP* 295), by means of various devices, is quite impressive, until one reads in Schnur (226 ff) a highly ingenious production of the same results from a passage of the Elder Cato's *de re rustica.* Marmorale approvingly cites the work of di Capua on Petronius' *clausulae*; but di Capua accepted the first century date: Petronius' *clausulae,* apart from those in the vulgar speech, are quite elegant and not easy to parallel from later writers.[2]

The end result of this complex inquiry is the lame conclusion that, given the textual uncertainties of the tradition, there is not sufficient reason to state that Petronius' Latin is impossible, or even unlikely, in the first century A.D. One might also agree that it is *possible* in the third century, though one would prefer this position to be logically argued.

---

[1] E. Paratore, *Paid* 3 (1948), 267-9, Paratore, 1961, 35ff, Schnur 138-49. Sufficient illustration, R. Browning, *CR* 63 (1949), 28f. On Apuleius, see V. Ciaffi, *Petronio in Apuleio* (1960).

[2] See C.U. Clark, *AJP* 1 (1929), 374ff; *TAPA* 59 (1928), 21; F. di Capua, *GIF* 1 (1948), 37ff—*Scritti Minori* I (1959), 353ff; for negative results, E. Thomas, *Pétrone*² (1902), 187ff; P. Kempe, *De clausulis petronianis* (1922, not published in full); E. S. McCague, *Clausulae in Petronius* (1930, unpublished thesis, Pittsburgh); E. Campanile, *ASNP* 26 (1957), 68ff; Paratore (1961), 55; R.G.M. Nisbet, *JRS* 52 (1962), 229.

Marmorale devotes much space (*QP* 275-326) to a complex argument that the *Satyricon* reflects the life and customs of the Antonine age, rather than of the Neronian. U. E. Paoli had made a similar attempt in 1937, which Marmorale at that time attempted to refute.[1] Marmorale now concentrates especially on the artistic doctrines given by Petronius to various characters.

In the first five chapters of the *Satyricon*, Encolpius and Agamemnon exchange views on contemporary rhetoric in theory and practice.[2] This is a theme much dwelt on by Greek and Roman writers of many epochs, but the evidence of one phrase inclines Marmorale to place Petronius in the time of the so-called Second Sophistic. The phrase is: *nuper ventosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit* (2.7). Marmorale claims that this can only denote the "Asianic" movement which developed in Rome around the middle of the second century A.D., and insists that *nuper* implies that the *Satyricon* was written not many years after the coming of the Second Sophistic.

The Latin is not specific enough for this argument to be valid. In a sense, "Asian" rhetoric was constantly intruding on the traditionally simple style of speaking which the Romans made a show of preferring. Petronius does not say that Asian rhetoric had recently invaded Rome: the text has *Athenas*. Nor does *nuper* necessarily denote only a few years.[3] The Atticist-Asianist controversy occupied much of Cicero's theorizing, for instance; another "Asian" invasion has been plausibly dated to Flavian times.

---

[1] Paoli's thesis and defence may be found in *SIFC* 14 (1937), 3ff; RFC 66 (1938), 13ff; *SIFC* 15 (1938), 43ff. Apart from a number of more tenuous points, his main argument was a supposed reference at 70.10-11 to the late custom of *manumissio per mensam* (post 200 A.D. cf. Gaius 1.1.2. the *lex Romana Burgundionum* 44. and Theophilus, Inst. 1.5.4). He was supported by A. Biscardi, *Manumissio per mensam e affrancazioni pretorie* (1939). The counter-arguments are to be found in Marmorale's *Petronio nel suo tempo* (1937) and A. Maiuri, *PP* 5 (1950), 223ff.

[2] [The exact literary intentions of these chapters is a complicated question cf. e.g. A.D. Nock, *CR* 46 (1932), 173; H. W. L. Nelson, *Ein Unterrichtsprogramm aus neronischer Zeit* (1956); P.A. George, *Arion* 5 (1966), 336ff.]

[3] Cf. Liv. *praef.* 12; Sen. *Ben.* 4.30.2, etc.

Nor, finally, can the second Sophistic be associated, simply or primarily, with a new style of oratory: it seems rather to have consisted in a growing importance of, and emphasis on, Asiatic sophists (hence the name) and rhetors, a matter of personalities as much as of styles. And these last differed considerably.[1]

Iannelli (143) pointed out that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing under Augustus, speaks of the *recent* ill-effects of Asian rhetoric in terms very similar to those used by Petronius,[2] and it has often been observed that Petronius' comments on oratory are very similar to those found in the Elder Seneca, Quintilian, and Tacitus.[3] It has even been suggested that Petronius was whimsically quoting verbatim some out-of-date Greek treatise on oratory, deliberately omitting to update it (hence *nuper*). But, as was mentioned above, the word can denote a long enough time to refer back to the controversy in the days of Cicero or, for the Greek world, even earlier. Consequently, even Marmorale's appeal to the corrupt † *Asia dis* † (44.9) can do nothing to associate the *Satyricon* specifically with the second Sophistic.

Marmorale's next topic (*QP* 74-80, 280-1) is the discussion of epic poetry which precedes the *BC*. He states that Petronius does not practice what he preaches, and concludes that Petronius' criticism is outmoded; he cites Fronto (157N) for the type of second-century criticism which he has in mind. But the Fronto passage in fact criticises Lucan for rhetorical repetitiveness, and this only as an appendage to a long discussion of the style of Seneca the Younger. Similar complaints about the rhetorical excesses of Lucan can be found in Quintilian and Servius, to mention only the best-known.[4] Marmorale's argument indeed could be used to show that Petronius was contemporary with any ancient writer who briefly comments on Lucan in terms similar to those of Fronto.

---

[1] See e.g. A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide* etc. (1923), 37ff, and the discussions there of the various theories put forward on the Asianism of the Second Sophistic by Rohde, Wilamowitz, S. W. Schmid, and others.

[2] See D. H. *iudic. de ant. orat.* 1.447 (compare ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῳήν with *nuper*).

[3] For the similar Roman criticisms, cf. Sen. *Contr. praef.* (13); Pers. 1.83ff; 3.44ff; Sen. *Ep.* 106.12; 114; Quint. *Inst.* 2.10.3-5; 2.10.7-9; 2.20.4; 8.3.22-3, 76; 9.2.72-92; 12.10.16 etc; Juv.7.150. In general, see S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation* (1948), cf. 4.

[4] Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90; Serv. *ad Aen.* 1.382; cf. Mart. 14. 194; schol. *ad Phars.* 1.1; Isid. *Orig.* 8.7.10.

Petronius' criticism is at once more subtle and more comprehensive (and the text may be suspected of deep corruption in several key phrases). In the first place, it is debatable that Petronius does not practice in the *BC* what he preaches in 118. He objects to Lucan's treatment of the historical subject-matter and to his inexperience, as well as to his rhetorical style. This is what we would expect from a contemporary, who would react more strongly and more conservatively to innovations by a possibly unpopular young poet.

To La Porte du Theil belongs the dubious honour of having devoted by far the most toil to a discussion of Petronius' remarks on painting and sculpture. Petronius' laments about the decline of these arts could, of course, date him to any period in history; but the *Aegyptiorum audacia* (2.9) has prompted many textual and art-historical conjectures. It has been connected with glass mosaics, the impressionistic "third style" of wall-painting at Pompeii, and referred back to the doctrines of Neoptolemus of Parium in the second century B.C. or some similar art critic. In fact, the phrase could refer to any number of the innovations proceeding from that strange country, of which our classical "knowledge" is, to put it mildly, slanderous. At all events, the evidence about the state of painting and sculpture in the first century at least permits Petronius' remarks to be taken as possibly contemporary.[1]

Marmorale (*QP* 287-8) argues also that the word *antescholarius* (81.1) as used by Petronius must be contemporary with *ILS* 8156, of Antonine date, since the word occurs nowhere else. Actually it occurs only in this inscription and in the *Lectiones* of Orelli, where it is in fact an emendation. The MSS evidence strongly supports the reading *antescholanus* in 81.1, as does *CGL* 3, 198-24, and even then, it is quite possible that *antescholanus* is itself a gloss, since at this point in the narrative the reader needs no reminder of who Menelaus is.

Terentianus Maurus (*de metris* 2492, cf fr. 19) states that (c. 200 A.D.) some lines of Petronius were commonly sung (or chanted). Marmorale (*QP* 288-91) suggests that since these lines are *insult,* they must be contemporary. But there are many instances of a good tuneful song surviving for centuries with weak or insipid lines or lyrics intact. It has also been suggested that the lines were chanted by schoolboys as examples of metre.

---

[1] H. Fuchs, in *Studien z. Textgeschichte u. Textkritik* (1959), 58 n.; Iannelli 296-301; Studer 213f; Beck 52-4; G. Becatti, *Arte e gusto negli scrittori latini* (1951), 160ff; but cf. also C. C. van Eyssen, *BVAB* 35 (1960), 90-1.

Marmorale also adopts Castorina's argument that Petronius wrote in the times of the so-called *poetae novelli.* Although Castorina has devoted a book to the subject, it remains unclear exactly what it meant by a *poeta novellus*: [1] Horace and Seneca seem to be considered *veteres,* and the distinction may be one of style and tone rather than of chronology. Since Petronius' minor poetry, or at least that attributed to him, differs in tone from most verse of the first century, it could easily be associated with the *novelli,* whatever they were. Apart from anything else, we have no assurance that Terentianus himself was aware of the date of the *Satyricon.*

Marmorale now turns to the *mores* and personages of the *Satyricon* and the age of the Antonines. In *QP* 310-3 he makes an attempt to show that the sexual licence and immorality portrayed by Petronius did not exist and were not possible until around 200 A.D., when perversion, materialism, atheism, and similar shortcomings were rife. His evidence for this assertion is the "evidence" of the *Historia Augusta* for the private lives of two emperors, Commodus (SHA 3.6, 5.10-1, 10.8-9) and Heliogabalus (SHA 5.2-5, 12.2). But other evidence (*ibid.* 33.1, 18.4, 31.5-7) credits Heliogabalus with various other ingenuities in vice, which perhaps outstripped those of the monster Nero and the two previous emperors. The *Historia Augusta* is a very perilous source for reliable facts about anyone or anything; it is certainly not contemporary evidence, whatever the truth about its date and composition may be.[2] But it shows also that the first century too was proverbial for sexual immorality, which is inconvenient for Marmorale's argument; and of course the general evidence for the licence of that century is too well-known to require detailed discussion.

Marmorale also uses the *SHA* to find parallels between it and the *Satyricon* (*QP* 297-310). It would be embarrassing to list these "parallels", and a burden to the reader to analyse them in detail. As it happens, Marmorale's procedure can be refuted from his own principles elsewhere in his book. His criticism, at times excellent, of the arguments for the Neronian date attempted to show (though at times it is only an assumption) that Petronius makes no specific reference to persons of his own time. This is conveniently forgotten when the *SHA* is discussed. One point involving the *SHA* will suffice; Marmorale thinks that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* were in existence at a time when the *Satyricon* was not, because the emperor Albinus read the former but not the latter (*SHA* 12.12, 11.8). But Marmorale concedes that this may be because Albinus disliked unnatural vice (*SHA* 11.7)—not that Apuleius entirely avoids such themes. In view of this sort of argument, one would like to think that the case for the late date is a parody of many of the attempts to prove the Neronian date from internal allusions, but Marmorale (*QP* 297) assures us that the *SHA* parallels are *anche piu comprobanti.*

---

[1] E. Castorina, *GIF* 1 (1948), 213ff; *I poetae novelli* (1949). Bagnani, *AE* 7 n. 18, curtly dismisses Castorina's conclusions. For fuller criticism, see Schnur 15 and Paratore (1961) 33.

[2] [See most recently P. White, 'The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*', *JRS* 57 (1967), 115ff and R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (1968).]

In *QP* 315-26 Marmorale develops an interesting legal argument about the problem of Ascyltos' gold ring (57.4) and Hermeros' attaining Roman citizenship (*ibid.*). He argues that Ascyltos acquired the status of *ingenuitas* and a gold ring with it—but Hermeros has another version of where the ring came from (58.10). As will be seen later, Browning has turned the dating argument of the gold rings completely around.[1] In Antonine times, the privilege of wearing such rings was widely accorded, whereas Trimalchio has been apparently unable to acquire such a privilege and consoles himself with the prospect of *five* rings to be depicted on his tomb (32.3, 79.9)! There is no need to analyse in full the argument about citizenship (*malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius*), since Marmorale's own remarks about the *constitutio Antoniniana* and the status of *dediticii* (cf. 107.4) are so qualified and cautious that a solid conclusion does not really emerge.[2]

Marmorale does not fail to end his book in a manner worthy of what has gone before. He finally suggests (*QP* 326-9) that the *Satyricon* was written by P. Petronius Polianus, a distinguished senator of the early third century.[3] This is supposed to tie up with the pseudonym *Polyaenus* which Encolpius takes at Croton! But the name of the lady involved is Circe, and the Odyssean epithet is of course appropriate: *semper inter haec nomina magna fax surgit* (127.7).

---

[1] *CR* 63 (1949), 12f.

[2] Cf. Bagnani, *AE* 4 and Schnur 69-73.

[3] *cos.* c.240 A.D., *RE* XIX. 1220, PIR[1] P217.

It is strange that Marmorale did not use certain obvious dating limits, one of which was provided by Ignarra:[1] the *vicesima hereditatum* was doubled in the year 212 A.D., whereas in Petronius it is consistently 5% (58.2, 65.10, 71.2). Schnur, not having read Ignarra, makes the same observation (74); he also notes (58) that the reference to *essedariae* (45.7) would be impossible after the year 200, when they were banned by Alexander Severus. A simple piece of evidence which renders most of Marmorale's parallels from the *SHA* irrelevant.

This chapter has concentrated on the arguments of Marmorale, since he had very carefully examined most of his predecessors for arguments which might suggest a later date. Some other arguments, of no value, may be found in Rini's exhaustive survey of Petronian scholarship in Italy from the Renaissance until 1936, the year before Paoli and Marmorale first wrote on the date of the *Satyricon*.[2]

4. INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE NERONIAN DATE

We may now turn to the various kinds of internal evidence in the *Satyricon* which might suggest a Neronian date or at least help to confirm it. In view of the different arguments for a late date, any plausible indications which suggest the first century A.D. at all will also be considered. Internal evidence is the traditional means of validating the orthodox view, and numerous "allusions" have been detected. Unfortunately, most of them have no value in a formal argument, since many allusions may be due to coincidence or are equally valid for some other date: Bagnani's example of Trimalchio's dislike of philosophers as a reference to Nero may be cited: as he says, if the *Satyricon* was written under Nero, Trimalchio's dislike might constitute an allusion, but the passage could equally well refer to some other person who disliked philosophers. Some scholars, sensing this objection to the argument from internal evidence, have placed more weight on the large numbers of supposed allusions; but if each one is open to criticism, then no aggregate of them, however large, can *formally* constitute a valid argument.

---

[1] *de palaestra neapolitana* (1770), 219; evidence in Dio 77.9.4.

[2] See also Rose, *Arion* 5 (1966), 275ff.

In what follows, I have mentioned some of the more convincing suggestions. I have tried to group them into broad categories, in each of which the arguments are given in roughly descending order of probability. In such matters one's judgement can vary almost daily, and it must be stressed that very few are to be considered as having any real value as *prima facie* evidence. Schnur, for instance, regards eight allusions of "evidential value": Petraites, Menecrates, Apelles, *horti pompeiani*, Maecenatianus, Carpus, and Hermeros—of which only the first three are really immune to scepticism, and then only when taken together. To clarify the argument still further, the large number of supposed allusions to the emperor Nero have been mostly listed in Appendix A, since all of them, however reasonable, are open to Bagnani's criticism at this stage.

5. Names in the Satyricon

Apelles. At 64.4 Plocamus says that in his youth his only equal as a singer was Apelles. If the action of the *Satyricon* is Neronian, then Plocamus' younger days will have coincided with the prominence of the Apelles who was a noted singer in Gaius' reign (cf. Suet. *Gaius* 33.1; Dio 59.5.2; Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* § 203).

Menecrates. Trimalchio (73.3) bawls out the songs of Menecrates, presumably a contemporary. There was a noted singer of that name under Nero (Suet. *Nero* 30.5; Dio 63.1.1).

Petraites. H. T. Rowell has recently shown that under Nero there was a noted gladiator named Tetraites or Petraites, popular in Campania.[1] We learn (52.3, 71.6) that Trimalchio greatly admires a gladiator of that name.

One can be legitimately sceptical of any one of these allusions, taken individually. But taken together, they virtually amount to proof of the Neronian date; the coincidence of times involved (Apelles being a generation earlier than the action of the *Satyricon*) ought to preclude reasonable scepticism. If a fair-minded examination of the other evidence does not militate against the first century A.D., the case may be considered proved.[1]

---

[1] *TAPA* 89 (1958) 14ff, arguing partly from the evidence of glass cups. See G. Ville, 'Les coupes de Trimalchion figurant des gladiateurs et une série de verre "sigillés" gaulois', in *Hommages à Jean Bayet* (1964), 722-33. The name *Hermeros* has also been discovered on these cups. For the other evidence, see Studer 221; L. Friedländer, *RhM* 10 (1856), 553 n. 5; F. Bücheler, *RhM* 27 (1872), 494, *Glotta* 1 (1907), 1f; *ILS* 5137-8; Schnur 35-7.

horti pompeiani. We learn that Trimalchio had supposedly bought *horti pompeiani* (53.5-6). This ought to mean gardens at Pompeii, since Trimalchio lives at nearby Puteoli and mention has just been made of a *praedium Cumanum.* Pompeii and the surrounding countryside was a near wilderness for some time after the eruption of 79, and therefore it seems probable that the *Satyricon* was written before them. But objections have been made, and it has been suggested that the phrase means gardens of Pompeianus or Pompeius. The area moreover must have made some agricultural recovery some years after the eruption, and it might have been possible to refer to the area by the name of the buried town.[2]

Maecenatianus. Trimalchio claims for his epitaph (71.12) the "*agnomen*" Maecenatianus, to which he is not entitled, and which is not part of his real name, as we see from the earlier inscription at 30.2. Therefore we cannot conclude that he had been a slave of Maecenas, who died in 8 B.C., but rather that he claims the name to indicate his pretensions to gracious living and the fine arts. The name is not found after the time of Vespasian, but since Maecenas remained proverbial for artistic patronage (cp. Italian *mecenate*), Trimalchio could have adopted the name at a later date.[3]

Opimianum. Trimalchio claims to serve *vinum Opimianum annorum centum* (34.6-7). The vintage of the consul Opimius (121 B.C.) was famous and became almost proverbial (Plin. *NH* 14.55). Some of it survived, almost undrinkable but possibly useful for blending, into Flavian times. There is no mention of it after Martial.

---

[1] For Marmorale's objections: *QP* 69ff, *Cena*² 196, the latter a reply to Rowell, valid against the unsupported allusion. Cf. also Beck 79f on Menecrates; for the coincidence of Menecrates and Apelles, Friedländer 12.

[2] Cf. Iannelli 163-74, Studer 221, Marmorale, *PT* 91-3. For Puteoli as the location of the *Cena,* see Rose, *TAPA* 93 (1962), 403ff. On the possible survival of "Pompeii", A. Sogliano, *RAL* 24 (1915), 483ff; G. Sanna, *RIGI* 1, (1917) 69ff; against, A. Maiuri, *PP* 3 (1948), 110-2. For Pompeianus, Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.4 &c., cited by Heinsius (258/342). For Marmorale's "Objection", *QP* 65f, 85-7. The gardens cannot be those of Trimalchio's former master Pompeius for Trimalchio inherited all his master's property (76.8).

[3] C. Hülsen, *MDAI* (R) 3 (1888) 222; cf. Heinsius 356/463; Studer 218f; P. Grimal, *RPh* 16 (1942), 161-3; Schur 38-42; P. Veyne, *Hommages à Albert Grenier* (1962), 1617ff.

Surely the ignorant Trimalchio, who, to judge from the label on the bottle, has been cheated by his wine merchant or is trying to impress his guests, can hardly have heard of the stuff after the first century, although Marmorale (*QP* 83-5) argues that what was proverbial for Martial would be proverbial for Trimalchio a century later; strained though the point is, it constitutes a possible objection.[1]

Cosmianum. Fr. 18 (Ernout)[2] cites a mention of Cosmian perfume in Petronius. Doubt exists whether this is a genuine fragment—it is omitted by Müller—but the perfume is mentioned by Martial and Juvenal. The Martial references imply that in his day Cosmus lived and worked in Rome (between, say 85-101 A.D.); but it is quite possible that the Arbiter of Elegance knew of the perfume long before it became known to the middle-class Spanish poet and had lost some of its rarity value. Moreover, "Cosmian" may have become a generic description.

Locusta. Gaselee tried, with some success, to emend the corrupt and interpolated text in 35.4, and apart from making better sense (or rather, better nonsense) of Trimalchio's astrology, he produced a possible reference to the poisoner Locusta, employed by Agrippina to remove Claudius.[3] But neither textual corruptions nor emendations can safely be invoked to argue the date of Petronius.

Scaurus. Trimalchio claims as a distinguished guest a Scaurus (77.5) who has usually been identified with the last of the aristocratic family of that name, Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus. (PIR^2 A 404). But there are many Scauri known apart from the gens Aemilia, and it has been much more plausibly suggested by Friedländer that Trimalchio means Umbricius Scaurus, the Pompeian manufacturer of *garum*, appropriately dubbed by Schnur (24ff) the

---

[1] See Iannelli 155-8; Studer 221; Beck 59-61; Schnur 45-8 and *CW* 50 (1957), 122, and most recently, B. Baldwin, *AJP* 88 (1967), 173, who goes over the available evidence.

[2] Its provenance is N. Perotti, *Cornu Copiae* (1513) 200: Perotti's value and reliability is defended by R. P. Oliver, *TAPA* 78 (1947), 173. Cf. Goldast and Burman 674/870; Iannelli 162f; and *TLL Onom* II. 666.2-7, 54-6. The references are Juv. 8.86; Mart. 1.87.2, 3.55.1, 9.26.2, 11.8.9, 11.18.9, 11.50.6, 12.65.4, 14.59.2, 14.110.1, 14.146.

[3] S. Gaselee, *A Collotype Reproduction of . . . the Codex Traguriensis* (1915), 17; for Locusta, see *RE* XIII, 1710f.

Ketchup King of Campania. But he might easily mean some other Scaurus who is not known to us.

Laenas. The giver of a *munus* named in 29.9 is identified by Studer (220) with Vipsanius Laenas, which is little more than possible at best. Burman suggested C. Octavius Laenas (consul *suff.* 33 A.D.) although allowing for other possibilities.[1] From this point on (and perhaps earlier) the argument moves into the realms of guesswork. The only conclusion we must reach is that only the first three allusions to names help to validate the Neronian date.

6. Imperial Events and Personages

inauditus mos. The guests at the *Cena* have their feet perfumed by slaves, and their toenails cut (70.8). The former action is described as an *inauditus mos,* for which Reinesius, though surprised at the phrase, duly cited Plin. *NH* 13.22 (348/454), which states that Otho had introduced this practice to Nero's court. But the Greeks and the Jews had done this for many years before the reign of Nero,[2] so the well-educated Encolpius can hardly have seriously meant that the custom was unheard-of, and we cannot therefore conclude that Petronius wrote this passage before Otho's demonstration. A possible explanation, as we shall see later, is that Petronius slyly alludes to Otho, implying that, since the custom takes place at Trimalchio's dinner, it is vulgar and ostentatious. We might then conclude that this passage was written after Otho had become a confidant of Nero and the joke at Otho's expense would only have been successful during Nero's reign. It is unlikely that the general public were familiar with the intimate details of court life while the emperor was still alive, and this might suggest further that Petronius is making a private joke for those intimate with Nero. But full discussion of this hypothesis must wait. As evidence proper the incident has little value.

Carving to music (36.6). Reference to this practice is not otherwise found before the younger Seneca or after Juvenal.[3]

---

[1] Vipsanius Laenas (*ob.* 56 A.D.): Tac. *Ann.* 13.30; *RE* IX, 1.A.168; *PIR*¹ V 459; C. Octavius Laenas: Burman 109-10/149; *RE* XVII, 1849, *PIR*¹ O. 29; cf. Marmorale, *QP* 88.

[2] On perfuming the feet, cf. the evidence in Bynaeus, *de morte Iesu Christi* I (1691), 3, pp. 254-61, cited by Burman 349/454; cf. Iannelli 176, Marmorale, *QP* 89. Otho was exiled in 58 A.D.

[3] See Schnur 30-1.

Unbreakable glass. Trimalchio tells (51) the story of the man who invented unbreakable glass, and of his unhappy fate. The Petronian version seems a garbled account of an event in the reign of Tiberius, as attested by Dio for the year 23 A.D. (57.21.7). Pliny, however, seems rather doubtful of its authenticity (*fama crebrior diu quam certior, NH* 36.195), although he does mention Tiberius in the context. The story is also reproduced by Isidorus and by John of Salisbury, which, as Marmorale points out, implies that the story kept its currency for centuries.[1] Burman (252-3/335) notes that Trimalchio's use of the appellation *Caesar* implies a post-Augustan date.

Buried treasure. The verses in 128 on the subject of illusory dreams were taken by Ludwig d'Orleans, as reported by Gabbema (614/795), to refer to the famous scandal of 65 A.D., when a certain Caesellius Bassus falsely claimed to have discovered in Africa the fabled treasures of Queen Dido. At the time the incident achieved great notoriety. It is true that Petronius' verses could very well refer to the frustration of the failure to find the gold, but references to the hopes of discovering buried treasure are so frequent in ancient literature that the allusion cannot be validated without some other sure indications of the date. (cf. Pers. 2.11, and 88.8 of the *Satyricon* itself for similar examples).

pater patriae. Astonished by one of Trimalchio's novelties, the drunken guests cry out "*Augusto patri patriae feliciter*" (60.7). Various attempts have been made to derive a dating argument from this phrase, but the title "Augustus" is common to virtually all emperors; and in the first century it seems to have been held by all the Julio-Claudians except Tiberius. Nero seems to have delayed taking the title *propter aetatem* (Suet. *Nero* 8) but took it later (*CIL* 3.6123, 7.12 etc.),

maledicere genio. Trimalchio's slave Mithridates was crucified because *Gai nostri genio male dixerat* (53.3), and Trimalchio refers drunkenly to his own *genius* in 75.2. Some have taken these references to be scornful mockery of the "new" imperial cult, as indeed the passage just discussed might be.[1] But as a dating reference it is useless; a form of imperial cult had started in Augustus' reign, and continued for centuries. There is no reason to suppose that *Augusto* (60.7) refers to Augustus specifically, nor is there any reason to date the allusion to Trimalchio's *genius* to the reign of Nero, with its manifestations of "un-Roman" religion.[2]

---

[1] Isid. *Orig.* 16.16.6; Ioan. Sar. *Polic.* 4.5 (248, 23ff Webb). See now W.C. McDermott, *C & M* 23 (1962), 143ff, who shows that Isidorus used both Petronius and Pliny. Cf. Marmorale, *QP* 81, Iannelli 123-6, Studer 220, Beck 62-3. For a Claudian date, Burman 252-3/335; for a Flavian date, G. H. Kraffert, *Neue Beiträge* etc. (1888), 10.

edictum de flatu. Trimalchio lectures his guests on their freedom to "break wind" (47.4-6), which may well refer to Claudius' famous *edictum* on the subject.[3] Presumably this would not be a generally meaningful allusion after Nero's reign, except to the learned—who rarely have works like the *Satyricon* written for their benefit. But it cannot be regarded as a certain allusion; Trimalchio's speech is only one of the many appallingly vulgar things which his guests have to endure. It could be typical Rabelaisian—or Aristophanic—humour.

regis filius. Hermeros, in an argument with Ascyltos, says *eques Romanus es? et ego regis filius* (57.4). Heinsius (282/372) points out that this is a possible reference to Pallas, the influential freedman of Claudius, who claimed descent from the Kings of Arcadia. However, such claims were by no means infrequent in antiquity; Maecenas is a well-known example.[4]

However, Latte showed that there was quite probably an allusion to Pallas in this passage; we know from Pliny that Pallas obtained the right to wear an equestrian's gold ring, and Hermeros accuses Ascyltos of wearing such a ring to pose as an *eques*. Momigliano observed the strength of Latte's argument, but Bagnani did not.[5] Pallas died in 62 A.D., and such a reference to him, if really intended, would not be understood long after that date.

---

[1] W. Süss, *de eo* etc. (1926), 79, F. Täger, *Charisma* II (1960), 295. K. Scott, *CP* 27 (1932), 317ff, on humorous treatments of the cult, ignores Petronius. On *pater patriae*, cf. Heinsius 304/400. For a discussion of the context, Rose, *CP* 62 (1967), 258.

[2] See the valuable remarks of H. Kleinknecht, *die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (1937), 187-92. On Neronian religion, H.P. L'Orange, *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture* (1947), 57-63.

[3] Suet. *Claud.* 32.5, cited by Scheffer 237/317, Burman 236/316.

[4] Hor. *Od.* 1.1.1; 3.29. 1-3 etc; Suet. *Vitell.* 1.2, *Vespas.* 12.2.

[5] K. Latte, *Phil.* 87 (1932), 266; A. Momigliano, *CQ* 38 (1944), 100; Bagnani, *AE* 4. The evidence is Pliny. *Ep.* 8.6.10. Pallas' death, Tac. *Ann.*14.65, Dio 62.14.3. On the date of the composition of this passage, Schnur 74. Dousa I. 13 in his comment on 27.5 refers to Pallas' habit of giving orders by gesture (Tac. *Ann.* 13.23).

Croton in decline. Petronius' description of Croton includes the phrase *attritas bellis frequentibus opes* (116.3). Haley took this to refer to the Civil Wars between Pompey and Caesar, with the implication that the dramatic date of the *Satyricon* is Augustan.[1] But the passage in question is highly stylised, and perhaps inspired by what we learn from Livy 24. 2f, which refers to a much earlier age, the Hannibalic period. Petronius' depiction of Croton, moreover- is not realistic; he makes it a run-down city of past glories (116.2), devoted to legacy-hunting, and an ironical reference to the Punic Wars would not be inappropriate.

essedaria (45.7). Burman points out that *essedarii* were known of in Rome at various times, from Julius Caesar until they were banned by Alexander Severus in 200 A.D. But they were noted in Rome as a novelty under Claudius.[2]

Galliae cives. Giton (102.14) mentions various possible disguises, adopting the appearance of various barbarians. One of his ironical suggestions is *increta facies, ut suos Galliae cives putet.* The implication is that Gauls are barbarians, which would not be possible in Antonine times, when Gaul was highly civilised. Further, the use of the word *cives* might suggest that Petronius is referring ironically to the generous grants of citizenship which Claudius gave to the more remote parts of the Empire; the Neronian policy was less generous.[3] But perhaps we should not press the meaning of *cives.*

Here again we have discovered little which reinforces the Neronian date; and we have been presented with a similar group of hazardous arguments.

7. Daily Life and Antiquities

Naturally, the allusions in this section can hardly be used to argue the date of the *Satyricon* with much precision. But some of them point to the first century; various fashions and usages are mentioned which were not found in Antonine times.

Sextiles. In the report on Trimalchio's estates, the month August is called *Sextiles* (53.2). It will not do to call *Sextiles* an archaism, as Marmorale does, since Petronius does not call July *Quintilis* (38.10), and since the late usage of *Sextilis* in Ausonius is almost certainly *metri gratia.*[1] Maiuri, *Cena* 186, says that *Sextilis* was still used in the first century A.D. in the provinces of Italy, but he cites no evidence. The correct solution, surely, is that accountants in Rome tended to use archaic and outmoded words, as we learn from Cicero, *Orat.* 158 (cf. the English *item*). But whether Roman accountants would have used *Sextiles* after the first century A.D. is doubtful.

---

[1] H. W. Haley, *HSCP* 2 (1891), 7.

[2] Burman 154/211; Caesar, *BG* 4.33; Suet. *Gaius* 35.3, *Claud.* 21.10; cf. *TLL* V. 2.861.

[3] Note the gibes at Claudius' policy in relation to the Gauls in Sen. *Apoc.* 3.3. For another instance of Claudian "liberalism", *ILS* 212; Tac. *Ann.* 11.24.

Wall-paintings. Studer (222) observed that Trimalchio's wall-painting (29.1-6) was in a first-century style. This is confirmed in a more detailed study by Bagnani. The recent discovery of a realistic painted dog in the atrium of a house on the Via dell'Abbondanza in Pompeii is further confirmation.[2]

Jewish customs. Petronius mentions Jewish customs in 102.14 and in fr. 37 (which appears to be genuine). His knowledge and ignorance of the subject is almost exactly the same as that of Persius. Both these writers were observant and well-read; in times later than the Neronian age more was known about the Jews.[3]

coheres Caesaris. Trimalchio's sharing the estate of his master with the Emperor (76.2) reflects a common practice of Julio-Claudian times; but, as Marmorale shows, it persisted in later ages.[4]

pica varia. Trimalchic has a talking magpie at his front door (28.9); there was a craze for talking birds in the first century, in which Trimalchio seems to share.[5] But it remains possible that talking birds were kept in later times.

---

[1] Auson. *Ecl.* 15. 11-3, cited by Marmorale, *QP* 94f. A unique example, to my knowledge, cf. Schnur 59-62; for the context, see Rose, CP 62 (1967), 258.

[2] G. Bagnani, *AJP* 75 (1954), 23-7. He argues that Trimalchio's house is designed like the house in which Trimalchio spent his youth as a slave, early in the first century A.D. For the painted dog, see P. Veyne, *MEFR* 75 (1963), 66.

[3] Cf. Pers. 5.184; N. Terzaghi, *Studi Funaioli* (1956), 426ff; Gaselee, *Materials*, Excursus 3. In Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2-8, e.g., we observe a somewhat wider knowledge of the Jews.

[4] Suet. *Aug.* 66.8, *Tib.* 49.2 (cited by Burman 378/489); cf. Studer 222, Beck 80f. For later times, Marmorale, *QP* 89f.

[5] Pers. *pr.* 8-9, Plin. *NH* 10.78; cf. Goldast 103/140-1, Studer 222, Marmorale, *QP* 87-8.

vigiles. Friedländer suggested that the *vigiles* who interrupt the *Cena* (78.7) are members of the special body of firemen instituted at Puteoli by Claudius.[1] However, most Italian towns may have had some sort of *vigiles,* and it is not certain from Petronius' account that the special Claudian *vigiles* are meant.

specularis. The use of *lapis specularis* in the *Cena* (68.1) is well paralleled from first-century evidence; but here again Marmorale shows that a later date is not excluded.

graecus mos. The Widow of Ephesus had her husband buried in an underground chamber, *graeco more* (111.2), though the words are expelled from the text by Fraenkel. This phrase puzzled van Wouweren 511/661, but Goldast's notes are satisfactory. The author of the *Dissertatio Isagogica* tried to argue a late date, citing Lucian, *de Luctu* 21, but this was neatly inverted by Studer (212), following Iannelli's refutation, and Schnur has now settled the matter.[2] A Roman would not call such a burial *graeco more* after about 150 A.D.

Beards. Schnur (55f) notes that beards are not usually worn by people in the *Satyricon.* One of the two exceptions is the sailor in 99.5, whose appearance is remarked upon (*barbis horrentibus*); the other is a cook (40.5), who is also strangely dressed. The phrase *barbam peregrina ratione figurare* (102.15) further supports Schnur's argument. The Romans began to wear beards again in Antonine times and slightly before. We cannot of course be sure that the fashion was adopted among the lower classes of south Italy, and there are a number of jokes about beards in Martial and Juvenal.

So much for the allusions to *Realien* in the Satyricon. As we have seen, some of them were hardly worth suggesting; but a few are sufficient to indicate that the *Satyricon* was written in the reign of Nero. Not many have real value as confirmation of this date, but it is perhaps significant for some that so many details should square with a first-century date.[3]

---

[1] Suet. *Claud.* 25.6, L. Friedländer, *Ind. Lect. Acad. Alb.* (1860), 3f; against Büch. 9; cf. also Marmorale, *QP* 103, opposed by N. Terzaghi, *AFC* 4 (1947-9), 123.

[2] *Dissertationis isagogicae . . . pars prima* (1797), 95; Iannelli 301-13; Schnur 43f. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 16.6 (the funeral of Poppaea in 65 A.D.): *corpus non igni abolitum ut Romanus mos.*

[3] For the value of arguments *en masse* cf. R. Browning, *CR* 63 (1949), 23f; Schnur 8.

If we forget the weak arguments for the orthodox view, and simply contrast the handful of firmer allusions, which fit into a striking chronological pattern, with the arguments of those who have suggested some other date of composition, then it should be apparent that the caution and qualifications which so many scholars have expressed at various times are unjustified. The value of Marmorale's work, however, lies in the fact that it has prompted scholars to strengthen and to tidy up the arguments for the Neronian date.

8. Society in the Satyricon

We may now turn with greater confidence to the economic, social, and legal background of the *Satyricon*. This is not a matter of putting forward individual allusions, which, as we saw, can be disputed, but of examining the details which Petronius gives us of social, economic, and legal conditions in the *Satyricon*. Petronius, it is clear, tends to depict the world of his day in a realistic manner, although we may have to make some allowances for humour and exaggeration. His depiction of Trimalchio and his career is full of vivid details which we are able to date with some confidence, thanks to our knowledge of the economic and social developments in the Roman empire. This is especially valuable, since advocates of a late date for the *Satyricon* have never managed to date these aspects of the work satisfactorily to the times which they advocated.

Detailed and thorough work on Roman economic and social history was not much found before this century, and so this aspect of the Petronian Question is not well documented. An article by Schnur resumes previous work and provides a strong argument for the orthodox view, though not necessarily for the Neronian date. Schnur is greatly indebted to previous scholars, especially Studer, Greaves, Rostovtzeff, Maiuri, Browning and Bagnani.[1] This section, therefore, is often a resumé of Schnur, with due corrections and acknowledgements.

---

[1] H. C. Schnur, *Latomus* 18 (1959), 790ff (for the rest of this section referred to as Schnur, *Latomus*:); I. Greaves, *Journal of the Ministry of Public Education* 361 (1905), 42ff (in Russian), whom Rostovtzeff follows, *SEHRE* 57f. See now P. Veyne *Annales, Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 16 (1961), 213ff; Bagnani, *AE* 10f. Beck (69, 78f) had pointed out that the sums of money mentioned at 68.8 and 71.12 reflect the currency values of the first century A.D.

Satire on freedmen. Studer (215-7) observed that the vulgar upstart Trimalchio would not be an object of satire except at a time when cultured Romans thought of such people *as* vulgar upstarts, making their money in unfashionable ways but in a spectacular fashion.[1] Freedmen like Trimalchio were found in Italy before the first century A.D., but in later times their existence did not call for censorious comment, and they do not appear then as objects of satire. It might also be observed that the Asian origin of Trimalchio and several of his friends is stressed, presumably as a satiric point; and this again would not call for comment or amused irony in Antonine times.

Trade in wine. Trimalchio started his money-making career by shipping wine to Rome at enormous profit, in spite of an initial setback (76.3-8). He therefore traded at a time when Campanian wine fetched good prices at Rome; but by the time of Domitian the wine producers of Italy were in difficulties because of competition from the provinces, and in the second century A.D. Spanish wine dominated the Italian trade in wine.[2] Trimalchio's venture, therefore, dates the *Satyricon* to the first century.

There is no need to assume a depression in the Campanian wine trade because Trimalchio had subsequently forsaken it. It was always a risky venture to trade in ancient times, and it was customary to invest profits from such transactions in safer business: in Trimalchio's case, landowning and money lending. Given a Neronian date for the *Satyricon,* we might note in passing Bagnani's suggestion that the high price of wine in Rome when Trimalchio made his spectacular profit was caused by the great spree launched by Gaius on his accession.[3] An important point is that the price fluctuates.

The economic background of Trimalchio's estates. It is clear that Trimalchio acted as an independent trader; but from the time of Hadrian onwards, traders were organised in, and hampered by, various guilds and regulations, of which there is no indication in the *Satyricon.*[1] Actually, all the traders in the *Cena* seem retired, and this argument for a first-century date is somewhat *ex silentio.* Trimalchio's success and prosperity, to which there seems to be no limit, implies that Campania was generally prosperous;[2] the income from his estates shows that agriculture was thriving, and they were organised as *latifundia* (48.2f, 77.3). This method of agriculture fell into desuetude after the Flavians, since slaves became increasingly scarce, and since, with governmental encouragement, the land was increasingly cultivated, with greater or lesser success, by free men. All these details, then, imply a first-century date; Trimalchio has hordes of slaves (37.9), and apparently no *coloni* on his estates.[3]

---

[1] Greaves develops this argument; I have not seen P. Paraf, *Pétrone et les nouveau-riches* (1919), which is cited by Schnur. T. Mommsen, *H* 13 (1878), 119, cites Tac. *Ann.* 13.27 for the social position of freedmen in the Neronian age; this passage in Tacitus is treated cautiously by R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 612-3. But the incident at least shows us that the behavior of freedmen was causing concern.

[2] Suet. *Dom.* 7.2; Schnur 49-52 = *Latomus* 794f; *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 5 (1940), 271 n. 8,273.

[3] G. Bagnani, *Phoenix* 8 (1954), 77 ff.

We might note also that Eumolpus poses as having estates in Africa (117.8), and we learn from Pliny (*NH* 18.35) that in Nero's reign six men owned half of the African province—until Nero got rid of them. Trimalchio also mentions African estates (48.3), although it is not clear whether they are already his own or not.

Captatio. The Croton episode in the *Satyricon* has as its main theme the satiric treatment of *captatio,* a practice very common in the first century and often attacked by satirists, but not much mentioned after Hadrian.[4] Here again it is reasonable to assume that Petronius selects for satire a social evil which was common in his own day.

Competition for office. Echion discusses the forthcoming elections for office in the town where the *Cena* takes place, and it is quite clear from his account (45.4-8) that the competition is intense. However, after the first century A.D. the tenure of such offices became a severe burden, and men tried to escape election or appointment. We know from Pompeian inscriptions that in mid-first-century there *was* competition for office, so Echion's gossip provides us with another confirmation of the orthodox view.[5]

---

[1] Bagnani, *AE* 11; Schnur, *Latomus* 795.

[2] Maiuri, *Cena* 14-17; Schnur, *Latomus* 791.

[3] R. Browning, *CR* 63 (1949), 13f. On the number of slaves cf. also Schnur, *Latomus* 796f; Beck 62; *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome vol. cit.* 24 n. 42; W. E. Heitland, *Agricola* (1921) 251-62, 272-4, 296-300, 321; G.E.F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul* (1941), 146-61; Seneca, *Ep.* 114.26, *TLL* III 1706.75-1709.42.

[4] Studer 217-8; the *TLL* offers linguistic evidence for the decline in *captatio,* although this too is an argument *ex silentio.*

[5] Bagnani, *AE* 11; Schnur, *Latomus* 791.

Such, then, are the main features of the economic and social background which incline us to a date in the mid-first-century. The argument is so strong that I have omitted many details, which are readily available in Schnur's article.

9. THE LEGAL BACKGROUND OF THE SATYRICON

We now turn to legal conditions and practice in the *Satyricon* as evidence for the date. Here, unfortunately, we are on less firm ground. A long study of private law in the *Satyricon* was made by Debray, but his views and deductions on the date of the *Satyricon* seem to derive more from his admiration for Collignon than from his own findings. Solimena's study of some aspects of the question is rather spoilt by his views on the locality of the *Cena.*[1]

Tributarius. To obtain a *terminus ante quem,* Bagnani (*AE* 3f., 6) points out that the words of Hermeros *malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius* (57.4) imply a date before the *Constitutio Antoniniana,* hesitantly dated to 212 A.D. This is not accurate; Hermeros speaks of his "preference" as having been exercised more than forty years before the date of action. But, as we observed earlier, we can obtain a satisfactory *terminus ante quem* by the references to *vicesima hereditatum* (before 212) and *essedaria* (before 200).

Manumission of slaves. Beck (71-4) seems to think that Trimalchio's intention of manumitting all his slaves (71.1) violates the *lex Fufia Caninia* of 2 B.C. But Trimalchio is not speaking of *all* his slaves, but of a privileged group of household servants who come flocking into the *triclinium.*

Castration laws. Iannelli 160-2, following Bongars (556/720), points out that Eumolpus' preaching against the evils of castration (*BC* 19ff.) ought to antedate Domitian's legislation on the subject, to say nothing of Hadrian's.[2] But, since Eumolpus is so fond of trotting out stale traditional clichés of moral import, the argument is not very strong. Besides, he is supposed to be describing the moral degeneration of Rome before 49 A.D.

---

[1] L. Debray, *NRD* 43 (1919), 5ff, 127ff; on the date, 14f; C. Solimena, *Il diritto delle colonie greche d'Italia nelle Satirae di Petronio,* in *Studi Fadda* (1906).

[2] Suet. *Dom.* 7.1.

Crucifixion of slaves. The report on Trimalchio's estates mentions that a slave Mithridates was crucified for the heinous offence of cursing Trimalchio's *genius* (53.3). We know that this punishment was not permissible after Hadrian. Bagnani objects that the Petronius passage is farcical in the extreme, presumably meaning that Trimalchio's report is fiction, designed to impress his guests. But Schnur argues that even a fiction like this must keep within the bounds of the law as it stands; otherwise the guests would perceive the fraud.[1]

Gold rings. Browning points out that Trimalchio dares not wear gold rings, much though he would like to (32.3, 71.9). In the first century these rings usually denoted equestrian status, and in later times *ingenuitas*.[2] We cannot tell whether Trimalchio wished to appear *ingenuus* or an *eques*, but it is worth noting that Ascyltos wishes to appear as the latter. But we do know that in Antonine times the privilege of the gold ring was rather freely accorded, and accordingly Trimalchio's trick ring and the presumptuous design on his tomb indicate the first century.

Let us consider finally Bagnani's recent argument for dating the *Satyricon* before 62 A.D. But since what follows is a complex refutation, it might be as well to sum up at this point the conclusions so far reached in the above discussion. It would seem that the social and economic background of the *Satyricon* clearly points to a date in the middle of the first century A.D. The legal background is much less valuable, although a date before Hadrian seems to be indicated. The reason for this is surely that Petronius sees Trimalchio's economic and social background as an object of satire, and uses to the full the literary technique of realistic portrayal. On the other hand, Trimalchio is not a criminal, so there is no need to bring in various legal points to add to the satirical portrait. Furthermore, it is quite easy to discern the actual economic and social conditions behind Petronius' satirical exaggeration and Trimalchio's boasting; in legal matters this would be much less easy.

Bagnani's argument, to which we now turn, was accorded by its author precedence over all other arguments for the Neronian date. This argument therefore is of great importance, because it convinced not only Schnur but also Rowell, and stood a fair chance of becoming canonical.[1]

---

[1] *SHA*, Hadrian 18.7; Bagnani, *AE* 11 n. 32; Schnur, *Latomus* 798.

[2] R. Browning, *CR* 63 (1949), 12f, cf. also Beck 74-6; Debray, *op. cit.* 23; L. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*[10] (English translation, 1957), 140-1.

Bagnani's argument is as follows. Glyco is said to have condemned one of his slaves, taken in adultery with Glyco's wife, *ad bestias* (45.8). Echion, who tells us about the affair, seems slightly angry about the whole business and says it was the wife's fault. Bagnani cites a *lex Petronia* (*Dig.* 48.8.11.1-2) which forbade a master *damnatio ad bestias* (*suo arbitrio*). He dates this law to 61 A.D., because (a) it must be later than Claudius' humanitarian measures concerning the treatment of slaves; (b) there is no comitial legislation known after Nero's reign which involves a Petronius and (c) it was probably passed in a wave of revulsion over the treatment of Pedanius' slaves (Tac. *Ann.* 14.42ff). Bagnani insists that Echion's anecdote is impossible except before the passing of this *lex Petronia*, and therefore that the *Satyricon* was written before 62 A.D.

This hardly distorts Bagnani's argument, yet it does not look very convincing. What is really wrong with it? In the first place, the *Digest* mentions Hadrianic *senatusconsulta* which appertain to the *lex Petronia*.[2] Surely this must imply that the original *lex* left loopholes which enables masters to condemn their slaves to the beasts. Admittedly, the details are obscure, but the need for legal riders indicates that the law's original form was not sufficient to satisfy the benign Hadrian.

I now set down eight points in Bagnani's argument where the argument from silence is employed, to a more or less serious extent. (1) The fact that Echion mentions no trial implies that Glyco did not need to invoke the law or obtain the permission of a *iudex*, that it was done *suo arbitrio*. (2) Bagnani's argument assumes that if a *iudex* had been involved, he would not have favoured the master against the slave. (3) Bagnani assumes that Petronius, unless he was putting up the motion on behalf of someone else, shared with Seneca a humanitarian attitude to slaves, hence that he might be the author of the *lex Petronia*. (4) We are told that there is no trace of comitial legislation under the Flavians. (5) The fact that we *know* of only one Petronius who was consul under the Flavians is supposed to be of significance for Bagnani's argument. (6) The fact that we *know* of no Petronius who was consul under Nerva is supposed to imply that the *lex Petronia* cannot have been passed under Nerva. (7) Bagnani admits that there are gaps in the *fasti* for 60-68 A.D., yet at times he seems to imply that the *lex* can have been passed only by one of the three known Petronii who were consuls in Nero's reign (he excludes A. Petronius Lurco). (8) He assumes that Glyco acted *suo arbitrio*, because otherwise Petronius would have used "the technical expression *dispensatorem damnandum dandumque ad bestias curavit.*" This, from Echion! [1]

---

[1] Schnur 67-9; H.T. Rowell, *AJP* 77 (1956), 185ff. Valuable criticisms by R. Browning, *CR n.s.* 6 (1956), 45f. Schnur, *Latomus* 799, says that he knows of no objection to Bagnani's theory; cf. the censorious judgement of K. Müller, *MH* 15 (1958), 253.

[2] That the *senatusconsulta* are Hadrianic is most probable. See the valuable remarks of D. Daube, *Law Quarterly Review* (1957), 386f; also H. T. Rowell, *AJP* 77 (1956), 187f, though he accepts Bagnani's reasoning.

Grave doubt must be entertained about Bagnani's attempt to date the *lex Petronia* to 61, and to identify its author. He quotes several authorities on Roman law who attribute the *lex* to P. Petronius Turpilianus, *ordinarius* in 61 A.D. Bagnani (*AE* 22) admits that this may be right, but he seems to think, from Tacitus' account, that the Pedanius incident happened in the latter part of the year, after Turpilianus had relinquished the *fasces*; this is not warranted.[2] Despite the gaps in the *Fasti*, Bagnani then suggests that the author of the *lex* is T. Petronius Niger *or* "Petronius Arbiter" (*AE* 23). It so happens that he dates Niger's consulship between 63-70 A.D. So it is scarcely surprising that he prefers to conclude that "Petronius Arbiter" is the author of the *lex*.

Bagnani thinks that it was Petronius Arbiter who passed the *lex*, because Tacitus says that he showed himself *vigentem et parem negotiis* (*Ann.* 16.18). Tacitus applies the phrase to Petronius' governorship of Bithynia as well as to his consulship; therefore the phrase must mean something different from legislation, as regards the governorship. This vigour and competence in Petronius' consulship may have been in legislation, but that was not the only duty or occupation in which a consul could distinguish himself: not that *par negotiis* is lavish praise.

---

[1] Another possible omission: Bagnani does not allow for the passing of the *lex* under Claudius, after that emperor's humane legislation, dated by Dio 60. 29.7 to 47 A.D. Could the Glyco incident be inspired by the occasion when the proverbial cuckold Claudius sent a man *ad bestias, legitimam poenam supergressus* (Suet., *Claud.* 14.3), and could the *lex* have been passed by P. Petronius, *homo Claudiana lingua disertus* (Sen. *Apoc.* 14.2)?

[2] Tacitus, however, does not necessarily give the events of a year in chronological order, cf. F. A. Marx, *H* 60 (1925), 74ff.

There are then so many holes in Bagnani's argument that it cannot be accepted with any confidence. The date of the *lex Petronia* is doubtful; its author remains unknown; there were clearly loopholes in it; and Echion anyway is no pedantic lawyer. I do not say that the theory is wrong; but it is best left out of account until the advent of new evidence. I hope to offer stronger reasons for a different date for the work.

CHAPTER TWO

THE IDENTITY OF PETRONIUS

1. IS PETRONIUS ARBITER NERO'S ARBITER?

It has been argued so far that the *Satyricon* was written in the latter part of Nero's reign by the man whom literary tradition knows as Petronius Arbiter. The second important aspect of the Petronian Question is whether we can identify this man with the Petronius who was for a time *elegantiae arbiter* at Nero's court. Traditionally, acceptance of the Neronian date tended to carry with it acceptance of the identification. Positive arguments are needed, however, since the *gens Petronia* produced several notable personalities in Nero's reign, including Petronius Turpilianus, A. Petronius Lurco, Petronius Priscus, and T. Petronius Niger. Of course, it could hardly be directly proved that none of these other Petronii wrote the *Satyricon*, but it can be shown in several ways to be overwhelmingly probable that the author was in fact Nero's *arbiter*, whether or not he is to be identified with one of the above.

The obvious reason for accepting the identification is the incidence of the word *arbiter* in both cases.[1] But this does not constitute proof, for the following reasons: the name Petronius Arbiter may be the actual *gentilicium* and *cognomen* of the author, and *elegantiae arbiter* may be a phrase devised by Tacitus himself;[2] in which case it could be pure coincidence that word "arbiter" is associated with both Petronii. Such a "coincidence" is, of course, even more striking if it is shown that the composition of the *Satyricon* dates to the same part of Nero's reign as the activity of Nero's Petronius; this, because Nero's serious artistic activity was not free from the guidance of Seneca before 60 A.D.[1] At the moment, therefore, the possibility of this coincidence precludes a confident identification of the two Petronii.

---

[1] A perennial argument that goes back to Pithoeus: cf. Iannelli 178-88, Studer 56, Schnur 8-12; Beck 23-5 avoids the question in an uncomfortable manner.

[2] Cf, e.g., R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 338 n. 5. For similar (?) offices, *TLL* II 407. 54-63. T. Sinko, *Eos* 15 (1909), 16, compares Tiberius' *a voluptatibus* (Suet. *Tib.* 42.7); also B. E. Perry, *AJP* 50 (1929), 300. P. Veyne, *RPh* 37 (1963), 258f, adduces Hor. *Od.* 2.7.25, *arbiter bibendi* (cf. *ILS* 8761) and compares Sen. *Dial.* 7.6.1, *luxuriae et voluptatium arbiter*.

However, the *Satyricon* itself tells us something about its author. In the first place, the whole work seems very different in tone, style, and length from the other known literary productions of the late Neronian age; and it is outside the mainstream of Neronian literature. The tone of the *Satyricon* is lacking in moral strenuousness, and is obviously in the style of a man whose attitudes were relaxed and epicurean.[2] All the passages which appear to be serious or morally elevating are set in a hilarious context; and, as might be expected, these "serious" passages draw heavily on the language and teachings of Stoic writers. This lack of sympathy with the Stoic writers of Petronius' day is expressed in 132.15, where he seems to claim for his own work a *nova simplicitas.*

It cannot be an accident that more literature has survived from the reign of Nero than from any other reign after Augustus.[3] In the early part of Nero's principate, there was a great resurgence of what we might call court literature, including the eclogues of Calpurnius, the Einsiedeln eclogues, the *Laus Pisonis,* and, on a lower level, the amusing squib *Ludus de morte Caesaris.* There was also the steady output of philosophical works by the younger Seneca, Persius' satires, and Lucan's *Pharsalia.* In a completely different class is the *Satyricon.*

Momigliano has traced with clarity and precision the literary crisis of Nero's reign.[4] In the early years there was a revival of Augustan motifs and hopes of "Augustan" patronage: as Martial put it later,

> sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones.

But this apparent truce between the predominantly Stoic tendencies of Julio-Claudian literature and the imperial régime began to break down by the middle of the reign. It is perhaps hardly chance that the court poetry belongs mostly to Nero's earlier years, and Momigliano suggests that Nero's great festivals might be an indication that the flush of enthusiasm was fading. Persius is clearly critical of the court poetry; Seneca has hard things to say about Maecenas and those who affect his habits and tastes (*Ep.* 114.4ff); and it is known that Lucan's honeymoon with Nero's favour did not last very long after the first *quinquennium* of 60 A.D. The reasons for the estrangement are partly political, and partly personal; Nero as *princeps* increasingly estranged the Stoic thinkers, and his personal vanity and ostentation must have been a source of irritation.

---

[1] See Tac. *Ann.* 14.15f.

[2] Cf. the charming essay of C. Pascal, *Epicurei e mistici* (1911), 13ff; M. Untersteiner, *A &R* n.s. 3 (1922), 252ff; E. V. Marmorale, *Petronio* (1936), *passim.*

[3] For general discussion, cf. H. Bardon, *REL* 14 (1936), 337ff; C. Morelli, *Ath* 2 (1914), 117ff.

[4] A. Momigliano, *CQ* 38 (1944), 96ff.

After 60 A.D., then, the Stoic standards of Seneca prevailed increasingly in the literary world of Rome, as Quintilian testifies: *tum autem solus hic fere in manibus adulescentium fuit* (*Inst.* 10.1.126).[1] But Petronius' *nova simplicitas* is opposed to the unreal imagery of the *Catones*, the orthodox and moralistic Stoic writers.

The attention which the usually austere political historian Tacitus pays to Nero's Petronius is sufficient indication of what a remarkable figure he was; as unusual from a political point of view as the *Satyricon* is from a literary point of view. The Tacitean passage suggests several points of interest as regards the author of the *Satyricon.* The Arbiter was obviously a man of exquisite taste, whose un-Stoic manners and friendship with Scaevinus suggest the dilettante Epicurean;[2] he lacked and probably despised the grand gestures and postures of contemporary martyrs. Tacitus says that on his death-bed he composed *faciles versus*, which indicates a clever and facile dabbler in light verse. Finally, the fact that he sent to Nero a catalogue of the Emperor's sexual ingenuities and perversities indicates that he took an interest, perhaps whimsical, in such matters.[3]

There are therefore five definite points of contact between the two Petronii. Both have the appellation *arbiter*; both pronounce on matters of taste—in the *Satyricon*, not only on poetry but also rhetoric, painting and sculpture; both have Epicurean attitudes, though not the high-minded and evangelistic attitudes of a Lucretius; both have little respect for the grand sayings and doings of the high, mighty and self-important; and both are able to appreciate poetic *tours-de-force*, of the sort found in the *Satyricon*, (23, 55, 89, 119-124, 132.15). Finally, both Petronii have an interest in and a knowledge of perverse sexuality; the basic theme of the *Satyricon* is a farcical homosexual relationship, which is farcical because of the continual and various bawdy intrusions which beset it. And both, it may be added, seem to display a marked scopophilic tendency.[1]

---

[1] Cf. also the neat comment in Tac. *Ann.* 13.3 *ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum.*

[2] Scaevinus was implicated in the Pisonian conspiracy, so Petronius' friendship will not have been based entirely on political sympathies. Epicurean elements in the *Satyricon*: 34.10 (!) 104.3, 128.6, 132.15, fr. 25-7, 30. There is no reason to suppose that he regarded the philosophy with much reverence; cf. E. Bignone, *RFC* 52 (1924), 150; O. Raith, *Petronius ein Epikureer* (1963).

[3] But see J.P. Sullivan, *Critical Essays on Roman Literature*: *Satire* (1963), 77f.

It might also be remarked that the author of the *Satyricon* is clearly of some social eminence; the fact that the language is not usually the exalted literary Latin of the early Empire does not matter. The tone is usually urbane, and the view of low life which the *Satyricon* gives us is obviously *de haut en bas*. There is, therefore, leaving aside for the moment possible objections, a strong presumption that the Arbiter of Elegance wrote the *Satyricon*.

In addition, it would seem that many features of the *Satyricon* which make it so unusual in its literary background can be explained by the demonstration that it was written for the amusement of Nero's court circle. It would explain the size of the original work, and why the *Satyricon* was so little known in antiquity; apart from its indecency and great size, very few copies will have been made in Petronius' lifetime—possibly only one, from which he personally recited to the Neronian circle the latest episode.[2] Thus we can both explain why the *Satyricon* is such a remarkable literary production, opposed to the generally affected Neronian literary styles, and also demonstrate that it was written by a Neronian courtier—in which case the identification of the author with the Arbiter of Elegance becomes almost irresistible. Let us consider the aspects of the *Satyricon* which especially evoke the Neronian circle.

In the first place, the spirit of the work is not only lighthearted but amoral. Nero himself was a man of vile private life, who said that all men, given his opportunities, would behave likewise.[1] Petronius' attitude to moral depravity is very similar, and he depicts the humbler folk of the Roman world which he knew as oblivious to any compunctions at all about their immorality. The introspective crises of conscience which Encolpius suffers are not created by a moralist. The spirit of the *Satyricon* seems one that would commend itself to Nero and his toadies—and not to any serious-minded lovers of literature, such as the "literary" public in Rome.

---

[1] See J.P. Sullivan, *The American Imago* 18 (1961), 353ff.

[2] G. Boissier, *L'Opposition sous les Césars* (1875), cf. 5; Lord Ernle, *Edinburgh Review* 231 (1920), 30. K. Büchner, *Röm. Literaturgeschichte*² (1957), 410, rightly discerns that the author of the *Satyricon* probably did not expect literary fame, or receive it, for many decades. Late publication is suggested by R. Colin, *RFC* 29 (1951), 143f; 30 (1952), 104 n. 4, 108. This might account for the lack of *testimonia* until Terentianus Maurus, and his confused remarks about the *Satyricon*.

As was observed above, Petronius never tires of poking fun at the opinions of the serious and high-minded. There are several passages in the *Satyricon* which, out of context, seem serious and sober; but their context is usually incongruous. This might be *ridentem dicere verum,* but one gets the distinct impression that the rhetoricians and philosophers get little sympathy or respect from Petronius. We might remember that Seneca had been Nero's tutor in the early 50's and Seneca was the most important rhetorician and philosopher of his day.

Another surprising aspect of the *Satyricon* is the close knowledge of the speech and habits of the lowest classes of Campania which Petronius exhibits, especially in the *Cena.* It was not enough for the author to be observant; an aristocrat would not normally mix with such people. Here again we may recall Nero's fondness for "slumming" in the lowest quarters of Rome.[2] It is reasonable to imagine that such expeditions took place in Campania also; hence Petronius' delight in accurately depicting people whose type would not be unfamiliar to the young emperor and his fellow-revellers. Petronius' knowledge of the people and conditions of contemporary Puteoli was very exact.[3]

---

[1] Suet. *Nero* 29.2: *neminem hominem pudicum aut ulla corporis parte purum esse, verum plerosque dissimulare vitium et callide obtegere.* Nero, then, would have enjoyed *simplicitas* in the description of immorality.

[2] His predecessor, if we may believe Juvenal (6.120ff), was Messalina. Evidence for Nero's revels: Tac. *Ann.* 13.25, 47; Suet. *Nero* 26.3-4; Dio 61.8.1.

[3] For the much-discussed identification of the locality of the *Cena* and Puteoli, see K.F.C. Rose, 'Time and Place in the *Satyricon*' *TAPA* 93 (1962), 402ff, where reference is made to the earlier literature. It is significant that most of the names in the *Cena,* if some allowance is made for nicknames and MS corruptions, can be paralleled in the few hundred inscriptions that have come from Puteoli (see *CIL* X), whereas the parallels are fewer in the

Various humorous aspects of the *Satyricon* would be especially pleasing to Nero. Petronius' treatment of vulgar persons and of vulgarity is amused but not censorious; most aristocratic Romans would carp.[1] Similarly, his treatment of homosexuality is amusing chiefly because of Encolpius' failure to preserve his relationship with Giton on a secure basis.

There appears to be in the *Satyricon* a number of jokes and allusions which would be understood only by those initiated into the Neronian *mores*. The most striking is the reference to the perfuming of the feet (70.8), a practice which Otho, who was "exiled" in 58 A.D., had shown to Nero. The Petronius passage of course only makes sense on the assumption that Petronius mocks Otho, and the joke would be unintelligible to those who were unaware who had taught the custom to Nero.

There are other possible allusions to Nero. It is sufficient here to note the reference to buried treasure in 128.6. These do not, of course, necessarily suggest composition *exclusively* for the Neronian circle; but the way in which Trimalchio seems to imitate Nero in small details implies on the part of the author and his audience knowledge of those details. Amongst these we may tentatively include the *pyxis aurea*, the *armilla aurea*, and the refusal (of Trimalchio's *procurator*) to wear clothes that have once been washed. These and other allusions are more fully discussed later in this work.

It does seem then that the author of the *Satyricon* was most familiar with the habits and doings of the Neronian circle, and this makes it very probable that he is identical with that circle's *arbiter*. He also seems to have written for the appreciation of Nero's friends, since he introduces so much matter of which the point would be obscure to any other audience.

2. OBJECTIONS TO THE IDENTIFICATION

Marmorale advances several reasons for not identifying Petronius Arbiter with Nero's courtier. These are: there are no frivolous suicides in the *Satyricon*, there is no *species simplicitatis*, and no

---

far more plentiful Pompeian inscriptions. In fact, those scholars who have given due consideration to the evidence of *CIL* X, Haley, Sgobbo, and Maiuri, have all concluded that the *Cena* is set in Puteoli.

[1] Nero, in spite of his noble birth, developed late in his reign an affection for vulgar and disreputable persons like Vatinius; it is possible that Petronius sometimes satirizes vulgar elements and customs in the Neronian court.

luxurious refinement such as we would expect from an Arbiter of Elegance. All these contentions are without value. The *Satyricon* *does* contain passages which indicate that the author was a man of taste in the field of literature and art; the humorous depiction of Trimalchio's vulgar luxury suggests that the author was well acquainted with more tasteful luxury and extravagance;[1] there are several farcical "suicide" scenes in the *Satyricon,* as well as Trimalchio's mock funeral in 78; and in the politically dangerous times of Nero a writer as politically harmless as Petronius could well be said to exhibit *simplicitas.*[2]

We may ignore Collignon's feeling that a consular would not write such indecent works;[3] the austere Stoics, Lucan and Pliny the Younger, wrote obscene poems at times, and Pliny said that this was done at various times by many great and worthy men.[4] *A fortiori* the Arbiter of Elegance can have done so.

A further weakness in Marmorale's argument was the mere assumption that Arbiter was Petronius' official *cognomen.* This is admittedly a widely-held view with Petronian scholars; because the literary name of the author of the *Satyricon* is generally given as Petronius Arbiter, it is automatically assumed that such was the man's name.

How probable is it that a member of the *gens Petronia* who held the fasces in Nero's reign could have had such a *cognomen*? The following instances of the *name* Arbiter are known from ancient Rome; two slaves, *CIL* X. 5490 (Aquinum), VI. 12282 (Rome), one common soldier, *ILS* 2362 (Mainz). There are no others. A consul in 355 A.D. was Flavius Arbitio (*CIL* XI. 6720.2); we know of an Arbitratus at Asberg (*CIL* XIII. 8595). The only other possibilities are two men whose names (?) survive as Arb——: *CIL* VIII. 22640.125 (Carthage) and IX. 6080.4b (Firmi). An "*arbiter*" features in the *Aulularia.*[5] The *cognomen Arbiter* is represented thus in *PIR*^{1}P 168: C(?) PETRONIUS ARBITER. This pathetic collection is supposed to be reconciled with such a name being held by a Neronian *nobilis*. Schnur (9) says that the *cognomen* Arbiter is "otherwise attested" (*sc.* than for the author of the *Satyricon*). Koll's statement (*RE* 19.1202): 'wohl mit Anspielung auf das wohl individuelle und noch nicht fest gewordene Cognomen' is an assertion that begs the question. It is better therefore to rule out the possibility that Petronius had such a *cognomen*. His acquisition of the name in his literary designation can be explained in two ways. Either the phrase *eleganiiae arbiter* in Tacitus was the historian's own phrase, which was adopted by later writers, or else Petronius enjoyed the honorary title while a member of the Neronian circle. This latter seems by far the more probable; in which case Petronius will in his lifetime have been known as the Arbiter. But to call this a *cognomen* is misleading in the extreme.[1]

---

[1] This is pointed out by C. Morawski, *Eos* 1 (1894), 1-4.

[2] [B. E. Perry suggested that Petronius wrote as he did because he did not dare write anything else, *The Ancient Romances* (1967), 205.]

[3] Collignon's objections are well answered by M. Margaritori, *Petronio Arbitro* (1897), 18-23, who (p. 85f) concludes after a careful study that nothing in Tacitus' account tells *against* the identification.

[4] Plin. *Ep.* 4.14.4; Martial (10.64.6) quotes an indecent line written by Lucan.

[5] Most of the evidence is cited by *TLL* 11.408, 19-30. Burman, *praef.* 7/7, calls *Arbiter* a name derived *ex studio et arte.* Cf. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina, SSF* 36 (1965), 362.

Other arguments for the identification have been put forward. Very commonly we read that "the *Satyricon* exhibits a psychological/spiritual/temperamental affinity with Petronius as described in Tacitus". This however is a subjective view and consequently open to simple denial. We must therefore leave aside the various attempts to substantiate the notion.

Bogner urged that *species simplicitatis* in Tacitus' necrology ties up with the phrase in 132.15, *novae simplicitatis opus*. But this latter passage addresses the Stoics in a literary context, whereas Tacitus surely refers to Petronius' political harmlessness and personal conduct and bearing. Bogner's article was quickly answered by Bickel, and it is notable that Hiltbrunner in his recent and thorough work on the work *simplicitas* notes the Petronius passage and the Tacitus passage under different sections:[2] But it remains true that both sorts of *simplicitas* were after 60 A.D. opposed to the contemporary attitudes of the Stoics in Rome.

Another point of contact is the interest which the author of the *Satyricon* shows in the "slave question". There is a good deal said in the *Satyricon* about the position of slaves and freedmen, and their ambitions. Trimalchio is usually harsh to his slaves, but, when drunk, indulges in maudlin sentiments about the brotherhood of man, in words uncomfortably reminiscent of Seneca's famous Epistle 47 on the proper treatment of slaves. But it may be only a coincidence that Tacitus' Petronius on his death-bed refused to reward all his slaves indicriminately, but had some rewarded and others whipped.

---

[1] For "unofficial" *cognomina*, cf. A. E. Douglas, *G & R* 5 (1958), 62-6.

[2] H. Bogner, *H* 76 (1941) 223f; E. Bickel, *RhM* 90 (1941), 269ff; I. Borszák, *EPhK* 70 (1947), 1ff; A. Maiuri, *PP* iii (1948), 103-5; Marmorale, *QP* 57-9; V. Ciaffi, *Struttura del Satyricon* (1955), 65 n. 3; O. Hiltbrunner, *Latina Graeca* (1958), 50, 66 n. 12 (using material from *ALL*).

Schnur (10-12) suggests that the phrase *vitiorum imitatione* in Tacitus constitutes a direct reference to the *Satyricon.*[1] He claims to be led to this conclusion by the supposed oddities of the usual interpretation of the passage; personally I see no need to reject the usual interpretation, "after his consulship, his reverting to a life of vices or assumed vices gained his admission to the small group of Nero's intimate friends". There is no reason to prefer Schnur's interpretation, although it remains *per se* possible.

However, if it is accepted, we have to deduce that the *Satyricon,* or at least the earlier part, was written before Petronius' entry into the Neronian circle. It has been suggested and I hope to prove that our passages from the 15th and 16th books *were* written for the Neronian circle, and that what we possess was written in 64-5 A.D. Schnur might of course argue that the earlier lost part of the *Satyricon* was Petronius' "passport" to the Neronian circle, but he would have to explain why such a work as the *Satyricon* should have been started before he had his audience. Schnur has plainly adopted Bagnani's date of composition, 59-60 A.D.[2] along with the erroneous view that Petronius held the *fasces* after losing his high favour with Nero. Schnur (67-9) seems in fact to accept that the *Satyricon* was written before Petronius' courtiership; and he says (57) that the *Satyricon* was written before 64, because Petronius must have been a court favourite for some time before his death in 66 A.D. Hence it is fair to say that Schnur's ingenious suggestion rests on the weak foundations of Bagnani's error over the date of composition, and an apparent unfamiliarity with Tacitus' style.

---

[1] See also H. C. Schnur, *CJ* 1 (1955), 353. The originality of this thesis consists solely in the confidence with which it is presented. The two previous scholars to suggest the same idea, more cautiously, were Iannelli 185 and F. Ribezzo, *RIGI* 13.3-4 (1929), 40: "*eco forse di un giudizio dell' antichita sul valore estetico dell' opera sua*".

[2] Bagnani, *AE* 26, who forgets Tacitus' explicit testimony that Petronius fell out of favor after his consulship: *mox consul . . . DEIN inter paucos familiarium Neroni adsumptus est* (*Ann.* 16.18).

3. PETRONIUS' PRAENOMEN AND COGNOMEN

So far it has been suggested that the *Satyricon* was written for the Neronian circle by the emperor's Arbiter of Elegance, and that what we possess of the work, from Books XV and XVI, was written in the years 64-5 A.D; that the *literary* appellation of Petronius is "Petronius Arbiter", and that "Arbiter" can hardly have been his official *cognomen.*

The identification of Petronius with Nero's Arbiter was based on what we learn of the latter from Tacitus. In one passage (*Ann.* 16.17) he is called simply Petronius, but in *Ann.* 16.18 he is according to the manuscript tradition, called C. Petronius. Pliny (*NH* 37.20) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 60 d-e) also record anecdotes about a Neronian courtier, T. Petronius. They tell us that this man made at least one insolent remark to Nero, although he managed to make his insolence sound like flattery, and that on his death-bed he broke an expensive wine dipper to deprive Nero of its possession. It is almost beyond question that this man is the same as the Petronius described in Tacitus; the only difficulty lies in the doubt concerning the praenomen.[1] The question is further complicated by the scholiast on Juvenal 6.638, who comments:

> Pontia, Publi Petronii filia, quem Nero convictum in crimine coniurationis damnavit, defuncto marito filios suos veneno necasse convicta cum largis se epulis onerasset et vino, venis incisis saltans, quo maxime studio oblectabatur, extincta est. (*Wessner,* p. 117)
> quam . . . convictam *codd. corr. Lipsius*: quae [Nero . . . damnavit] *Brugnoli*

If Lipsius' emendation is right, then we have to reckon with a P. Petronius who was condemned for "conspiracy" as the Arbiter was. Brugnoli however believes that the gloss on Petronius, which in any case is to be found in only two of the MSS, slipped into the text from elsewhere. And our reservations about the text go hand in hand with our natural doubts about the reliability of the scholiast here: apart from the father's name, the whole story looks suspiciously like a fantasy based on the Juvenal passage.[2]

---

[1] Both, of course, are consulars; the breaking of the dipper (Pliny) ties up with the breaking of the signet-ring (Tacitus). Paratore (1961) 14 suspects a discrepancy; Petronius robbed Nero of a legacy, according to Pliny, but Tacitus "*anzi sembra escludere*" that Petronius made Nero one of his heirs. Neither of these interpretations carries conviction.

[2] See G. Brugnoli *RCCM* 3 (1961), 317ff; also Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* VII, 509ff, and Wessner's edition, p. xxxvii ff.

But grave doubts must also be entertained about the text of the Tacitus passages. It is most unusual for him to give a man's *nomen* alone at the first mention, and at the second mention to give his *praenomen* also. On the other hand, Pliny gives the two names according to his usual procedure, and Plutarch writes *Titus* in full. It looks, then, at first sight as though Titus is the correct *praenomen*, and that Tacitus, or his MS, is at fault.

Bagnani, however, has reservations about the reliability of Pliny. He cites an example of Pliny giving another Petronius the wrong *praenomen*, but this Petronius is not contemporary, but early Augustan; and it is tempting to suspect a dittography there in the MSS of the NH,[1] as we might suspect precisely the same dittography in the two MSS of the Juvenal scholiast. Even if we believe the text and posit a P. Petronius condemned by Nero, we still have to reckon with the fact that in matters of first-century prosopography the Juvenal *scholia* are demonstrably unreliable, written as they were in the second half of the fourth century. Therefore we can exclude the possibility that the Arbiter's *praenomen* was Publius; the evidence for Titus or Gaius is much stronger.[2]

Pliny was a near-contemporary of the Arbiter, and was probably in Rome around the time of his consulship.[3] It is therefore probable that he knew of the Arbiter and will have got his *praenomen* right. However, given the traditional preference for the *praenomen* Gaius, it is necessary to argue the question more strictly.

From what sources are our *testimonia* concerning Petronius derived? The full account of Tacitus most probably comes from Cluvius Rufus, who was an intimate of the Neronian court and must have known the Arbiter.[4] Cluvius surely had the *praenomen* right. Cluvius, then, or Tacitus' source if not Cluvius, wrote *Gaius*, or *Titus*, or else omitted the *praenomen*. Pliny either had Cluvius as a source, in which case Cluvius wrote *Titus* or else omitted the *praenomen*; or else Pliny wrote the *praenomen* from his own knowledge. If Pliny had some other source, then that source had Titus also. Plutarch most probably took his anecdote from Cluvius, since it entails a private or social confrontation between Petronius and Nero; if he used some other source, we still have to reckon with an account written by someone who would have known the Arbiter's *praenomen*. Plutarch's source is not likely to be Pliny, whom he never mentions; on the other hand, Cluvius is one of the very few Roman writers of the Imperial Age whom he *does* mention.[1]

---

[1] *NH* 6.181, P(C) Petronius, cf. Dio 54.5.4, PIR¹ P 196, Stein, *RE* XIX. 1197; Bagnani, *AE* 23 n. 78. Büch. vi ignores Pliny and suggests that Plutarch's text should be emended to *Gaius*.

[2] Only Degrassi, *Fasti consolari* (1952), 18, admits the reasonable possibility of Publius as the Arbiter's *praenomen*, cf. Bagnani, *AE* 86-8.

[3] There is no indication that Pliny was employed outside Italy after 58 A.D. Observe *NH* 5.14 (cited in *RE* XXI. 276): (Paulinus) *quem consulem vidimus* (66 A.D.), cf. E. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), 398; H.G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres* (1960), 106 ff.

[4] Suet. *Nero* 21.2, Dio 63.14.3, cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 294. It seems not to have been observed before that the Tacitean portrait of Petronius ought to come from Cluvius' History. For a guess at Tacitus' source, C. Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales di Tacito* (1960), 205.

From this complex argument it appears that what we know of Petronius must derive from the accounts of people who knew the Arbiter intimately, and that Plutarch is almost certainly independent of Pliny. Therefore we have independent testimony of two writers that the Arbiter's *praenomen* was Titus, and Plutarch's source was probably Cluvius.

We can only accept the suspect reading *Gaius* in Tacitus on the assumption that Plutarch's account derives from Pliny, who made a mistake, and that Tacitus' source, whether Cluvius or not, wrote *Gaius*—unless his source gave no *praenomen* and Tacitus made a mistake.

I consider it almost certain, then, that the Arbiter's *praenomen* was Titus. The reading *Gaius* in Tacitus' MS tradition is easily explained. This tradition is full of erroneous nomenclature, much of which has rightly been remedied by emendation.[2] *C.* might easily be an interpolation, or else a simple mistake for *T.* It is relevant to point out that in certain scripts, including Beneventan, *T* is very similar to *C*. Most editors have emended the text in various ways to give the Arbiter the *praenomen* Titus.[3]

---

[1] *QR* 107, *Otho* 3.2, cf. W. Vornefeld, *de scriptorum latinorum locis a Plutarcho citatis* (1901); H. Peter, *HRR* II (1906), 114-5. Plutarch's essay on flattery and friendship is, incidentally, dated between 90 and 116 A.D. by C. P. Jones, *JRS* 56 (1966), 72.

[2] For corruptions, cf. G. Andresen, *WKPh* 1915, coll. 1097-1101, 1121-5.

[3] Suggested interpolation, Ramsay on *Ann.* 16.18; A.G. Amatucci, *La letteratura di Roma imperiale* (1947), 315. Brugnoli, *art. cit.*, 325-8, demonstrates at great length how easily the Tacitus *MS* may have been corrupted. He gives a list of the various emendations: add [ac] <*T*> *Petronius* (Drexler), and the agnosticism of Lipsius (1585), p. 473 on *Ann.* 16.18.

We may now attempt to identify Petronius with one of the several Petronii who were prominent in the reign of Nero.

A. Petronius Lurco can be eliminated since the *praenomen* is wrong and his consulship (*suff.* 58) is too early. Petronius Turpilianus survived the reign of Nero, so he cannot be identical with the Arbiter; Petronius Priscus was killed in 65 A.D.[1] There remains T. Petronius Niger. This is a promising candidate, since the *praenomen* is right. His consulship dates to around 61 A.D., since his colleague, Q. Manlius Ancharius Torquatus Saturninus, was proconsul of Africa in 71/2, and the interval between the consulship and the governorship of Africa at this time was around ten years; possibly less, because of the Civil Wars.[2]

It is the contention of this study that the *Satyricon* was written for the Neronian court, and Tacitus tells us that Petronius joined the court circle only after his consulship. Since Books XV-XVI were written, as will emerge, in 64-5 A.D., we may suppose that the *Satyricon* was probably started before 63 A.D., given its presumed length. The *fasti* for 58-59 A.D. are complete, and therefore the Arbiter's consulship dates to about the same time as that of Niger.

This might be sufficient reason to identify Niger with the Arbiter, but Bagnani has expressed doubts, and some scholars have gone along with him.[3] The first of these doubts can be immediately dismissed. Bagnani notes that the wax tablets which include the name of Niger also provide the names of many freedmen of a C. Petronius, and he advances this as another reason for accepting the *praenomen* Gaius.[1] But there is no reason to believe that these freedmen are those of the Arbiter, even though, by an interesting coincidence, the name Malchio appears on one of the tablets.[2] Bagnani's main objection, however, needs fuller consideration. He denies that Niger can be the cognomen of the Arbiter of Elegance, because the latter is mentioned without a *cognomen* by Tacitus; he might have added that Pliny and Plutarch also fail to give a *cognomen*. Bagnani is quite emphatic about this point; if Petronius had a *cognomen*, he says, "Tacitus would certainly have given it" (*AE* 23 n. 78).

---

[1] Petronius Turpilianus, Tac. *Hist.* 1.6, Plut. *Galba* 15.2; Priscus, *Ann.* 15.71. [P. B. Corbett identifies our Petronius with the elder brother of Petronius Turpilianus, see *Petronius* (1970), p. 11.]

[2] Niger is known from tablets found at Herculaneum, see G. Pugliese Carratelli, *PP* 1 (1946) 373 ff; 3 (1948), 165 ff. The relevant tablet is 'Ins. V n. 22' and reads:

> Chir(ographum) L. Comini Primi
> ex nomine facto
> Actum Neapoli pr(idie) Idus Iulias
> Q. Manlio Tarquitio Saturnino
> T. Petronio Nigro cos.

Niger is common in the first century A.D., cf. Kajanto, *op. cit.* n. 20 above, 228. For Saturninus' governorship, see *IRT* 300 (Lepcis).

[3] Bagnani, *AE* 23 n. 78, see also Degrassi's *Fasti*; he is followed by Rowell, Schnur and Brugnoli (331). The identification was first suggested by R. Browning, *CR n.s.* 4 (1954), 33, followed by R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 387 n. 6, 743. The identification seems tacitly accepted by G. Brugnoli in his palaeographical sample, *Petronius* (1961), 20. The conclusions of S. Spoto, *L'identificazione di Petronio* (1948) have been impossible to ascertain, cf. R. Murh, *AAHG* 9 (1956), 11.

This assertion stems from the commonly accepted view that Roman writers of imperial times do not usually refer to men having the *tria nomina* by their *praenomen* and *nomen* alone; they use either all three names, or *praenomen* and *cognomen*, or *nomen* and *cognomen*. It is this that allows Bagnani to dismiss the possibility that Tacitus' Petronius (and presumably the Tacitus of Pliny and Plutarch) can be identical with Petronius Niger. Bagnani's dismissal was countered by R. Browning,[3] who pointed out that there are many instances in Tacitus of the *cognomen* being omitted when a year is indicated by the names of its consuls. This, however, is a special usage, and need not affect the general rule.

It is therefore worth examining in some detail the way in which Pliny, Tacitus, and Plutarch give names. Now in Pliny's testimony we find *T. Petronius consularis*, and we need not therefore examine the scores of instances in the *NH* where Pliny omits the *cognomen* of men with the *tria nomina*; we need only note his nomenclature in the instances where he names a man and adds the adjective *consularis*. They are as follows (with their numbers as listed in Pauly-Wissowa *sub gentilicio*):

---

[1] Bagnani, *AE* 49, n. 12, who also suggests that Petronius modelled the freedmen in the *Cena* on some of these men. Elsewhere he has argued that Trimalchio was based on a real person, an ex-slave well known to Petronius: see *Phoenix* 8 (1954), 77 ff.

[2] Malchio, *PP* 3 (1948), 179. The name is not uncommon.

[3] *CR* n.s. 6 (1956), 46. Pliny's nomenclature has been little studied: M. Bacherler, *WKPh* 1915, col. 235 f, is brief and of no value for our present purposes.

7.173, (Acilius) Aviola, *RE* 19, *PIR*² A 46: *cos. anno incerto* (republican).
9.213, L. Apronius (Caesianus), *RE* 6, *PIR*² A 972: *ord.* 39 A.D.
9.67, (Ser.) Asinius Celer, *RE* 10, *PIR*² A 1225: *suff.* 38 A.D.
32.123, (M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus) Messallinus, *RE* 111, *PIR*² A 1488: *ord.* 20 A.D.
10.52, (A. Caecilius) Metellus (Pius) Scipio, *RE* 99: *suff.* 52 B.C. (republican).
34.48, C. Cestius (Gallus), *RE* 9, *PIR*² C 691: *suff.* 42 A.D.
26.5, (L.) Iulius Rufus, *RE* 445, *PIR*¹ I 349: *ord.* 67 A.D.
26.5, (C.) Laecanius Bassus, *RE* 4, *PIR*¹ L 16: *ord.* 64 A.D.
7.183, A. Manlius Torquatus, *RE* 73: *ord.* 164 B.C. (republican).
35.21, Q. Pedius, *RE* 1, cf. *PIR*¹ P 148, his grandson: *ord.* 43 B.C. (republican).
37.20, T. Petronius (?Niger), *RE* 29, *PIR*¹ P 201: *suff.* c. 61 A.D.
7.80, (P. Calvisius Sabinus) Pomponius (Secundus), *RE* 103, *PIR*¹ P 563: *suff.* 44 A.D.
24.43, M. Servilius (Nonianus), *RE* 69, *PIR*¹ S 420: *ord.* 35 A.D.

It appears from this list that when Pliny refers to men of imperial times with the adjective *consularis* he tends to omit the *cognomen*, at least in four examples out of nine, five if we include Petronius Niger. Moreover it is easy to show how irregular Pliny's nomenclature can be by listing the other passages in the *NH* where he mentions the consulars just enumerated and noting the varying names in each case:

Messallinus. 10.52, Messallinus Cotta; 1.14, Cotta Messallinus; 1.15, Cotta Messallinus.
Cestius. 15.49, Cestius; 10.123, a consular dating.
Pomponius. 7.39, Pomponius; 13.83, Pomponius Secundus *vates*; 14.56, Pomponius Secundus.
Servilius. 10.123, consular dating; 37.81, Servilius Nonianus; 28.29, M. Servilius Nonianus *princeps civitatis.*
Scipio. 1.8, Metellus Scipio; 1.29, Metellus Scipio; 8.196, Metellus Scipio; 7.94, Scipio; 10.52, Scipio Metellus.[1]

Furthermore, if Petronius is a literary rather than a political figure for Pliny, it is even more likely that his *cognomen* will be omitted. Even in imperial times writers tended to be mentioned without their *cognomen*, especially by Pliny, as his lists of authorities and writers prove.

When we turn to Tacitus we find that he, like Pliny, tends to omit the *cognomina* of republican or literary figures, as well as those of consuls when he indicates a year. Here are the instances in Tacitus where he omits a known *cognomen*, giving *nomen* and *praenomen* only, with a comparison of the nomenclature for them in other passages (book numbers refer to the *Annals* unless otherwise specified):[1]

---

[1] At *NH* 37.18 the text is corrupt and conceals the name of a *vir consularis*, possibly Nonianus. The word *consularis* occurs also in 15.91, 11.49, 18.111 (via), 7.142, 29.10, 36.203.

L. Antistius (Vetus), 14.48, and 13.11 (consular dating): but L. Vetus, 13.53, 16.10 (twice); Vetus, 16.12, 22.
A. Caecina (Severus), 1.31, 72: but elsewhere in the first book simply Caecina; Caecina Severus, 3.18; Severus Caecina 3.33; Caecina, 3.34 (twice).
C. Cassius (Longinus), 12.11, 13.41, 48, 14.42, 15.52, 16.7; but simply Cassius, 16.8, 22.
L. Cassius (Longinus), 6.15: but Cassius Longinus, 6.45.
C. Cestius (Gallus), 15.25 (as in Pliny): but Cestius Gallus, *H.*5.10.
A. Didius (Gallus), 12.40, 14.29: but simply Didius, 12. 15; Didius Gallus, *Agric.* 14.
Cn. Domitius (Ahenobarbus), 4.75, 6.1 (consular dating), 6.45, 47, 13.10: but Domitius, 6.48; Cn. Ahenobarbus, 12.3.
L. Domitius (Ahenobarbus), 1.63, 4.44.
P. Egnatius (Celer), 16.32: but P. Celer, *H* 4.10, 40.
M. Ostorius (Scapula), 12.31: but Ostorius Scapula, 14.48, 16.4; Ostorius, 16.14 (twice), 16.15 (twice).
P. Ostorius (Scapula), 12.31: but Ostorius, 12.35, 12.39 (twice); Ostorius Scapula, *Agric.* 14.
(C.) Petronius (?), 16.18, but in 16.17 C(?) Petronius (MS doubtful).
C. Plinius (Secundus), 1.69, 15.53, *H.*3.28: but simply Plinius, 13.20.
Q. Pomponius (Secundus), 6.18, 13.43: but Pomponius, 6.8.
P. Pomponius (Secundus), 11.13, 12.27: Pomponius, 12.28 (twice); Pomponius Secundus, 5.8; Secundus Pomponius, *Dial.* 13.
C. Sallustius (Crispus), 3.30.
M. Servilius (Nonianus), 14.19, 6.31 (consular dating); Servilius Nonianus, *Dial.* 23.
C. Silius (A. Caecina Largus), 1.31, 72, 2.25, 3.42, 4.18: but Silius, 2.6, 7 (twice), 3.42, 45, 46, &c.
P. Suillius (Rufus), 4.31, 13.42: Suillius, 11.1, 2 (twice), 4, 5, 6 (twice), 13.43 (twice).
C. Vibius (Serenus), 2.30: but Vibius Serenus, 4.13, 28; Serenus, 4.29, 30 (twice).
L. Volusius (Saturninus), 12.22, 13.30: Volusius, 14.56.
Q. Volusius (Saturninus), 13.25 (consular dating), 14.46.
L. Volusius (Saturninus), 3.30.

---

[1] Some prosopographical and textual discussions have had to be omitted; the text adopted is usually that of Fischer, although Fabia's *Onomasticon* and other prosopographical works have been consulted. But even if a third of the examples were disputed, the conclusions concerning Tacitus' nomenclature would not be affected.

Much of all this is due to what Syme calls "Tacitus' artistic inconsistencies in the citation of proper names",[1] and Tacitus does differ from Pliny in his employment of the word *consularis*. He provides the *cognomen* in *H*.1.6, 15.72, 3.51, 66, 6.4, 40, 13.32. In 2.33, 3.22 and 12.1 the man named has no *cognomen*. But in 11.13 he names P. Pomponius Secundus as *consularis*, omitting the *cognomen*, exactly as Pliny (*NH* 7.80) does.

But what is perfectly clear is that, although neither Pliny nor Tacitus give Petronius a *cognomen*, he may in fact have had one. And it may be further stressed that omission of a *cognomen* is even more common when a literary man is referred to: Tacitus, for instance, omits the *cognomina* of Sallust and the elder Pliny. Plutarch, not being a contemporary, would naturally depend on his Roman source, probably Cluvius Rufus, who may be suspected of the same general inconsistency.

Bagnani's assertion is therefore false, and Petronius may have had a *cognomen*. Was that *cognomen* Niger? We have already seen that Niger's consulship is of roughly the same date as the Arbiter's, and both men have the *praenomen* Titus. There are, however, two more reasons for identifying the two Petronii. The first is, that Pliny, referring to *T. Petronius consularis*, is surely being most imprecise if there were two *T. Petronii consulares*, more or less contemporary; he might be referring to either. Admittedly, this argument is somewhat *ex silentio*; but it is reasonable to expect that, had there been two Petronii who held the *fasces* at around the same time, both named Titus, there would have been for Pliny some means of distinguishing them.

The second reason is, that in the Neronian age the Pontii and the Petronii were in some way connected by family, as we know from the name C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus.[2] Pontius reminds us of Pontia in the Juvenal scholiast, who might conceivably be the daughter of the Arbiter; the name Nigrinus recalls Niger. Thus there might possibly be some family relationship between Niger, Petronius Arbiter, and Pontia. It is of course impossible to reconstruct the family tree with any probability, but the suggestions of Borghesi and Bagnani are in need of correction.[3]

---

[1] *JRS* 38 (1948), 122; cf. 39 (1949), 6-7.

[2] *RE* XXII.40-1, PIR^{1}P 218, *ord.* 37 A.D. Nipperdey thought that Tacitus confused this man with the Arbiter, hence the praenomen Gaius.

[3] B. Borghesi, *Oeuvres* III (1864), 365; Bagnani, *AE* 53. We can at last

The only way to deny the identification of the Arbiter with Niger is to accept Gaius as the Arbiter's *praenomen* and to deny that he is identical with the T. Petronius mentioned by Pliny and Plutarch. In which case we would have two Neronian courtiers, both consulars, named Petronius: C. Petronius Arbiter and T. Petronius Niger. The former would be the bearer of an impossible *cognomen*,[1] rubbing shoulders at the court with Niger, whose flattering insolence about Nero's style of living, expensive taste in myrrhine ware, and irreverent suicide make him appear as an Arbiter of Elegance in his own right!

4. PETRONIUS' CAREER

T. Petronius Niger then was of good family; Bagnani's suggested *stemma* makes him the son of C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus, and grandson of C. Petronius Umbrinus. Whether this be right or not, it is clear that he was connected by family with the members of the *gens Petronia* who attained eminent positions in the reign of Nero. It is clear also that he was a wealthy man; he owned a precious *trulla* and an estate near Cumae, and he must have been wealthy to rise to the consulate.

Since he held the *fasces* between the years 60 and 63 A.D., he will have been born around the year 20 A.D. Coming, presumably, from a wealthy family, he will have had the usual "University" education—possibly in Athens, but it is not out of the question that he spent some time in Massilia, for we learn from frr. 1 and 4 that at least two adventures in the *Satyricon* were set in that town, and Petronius shows some knowledge of local customs. It might be that he was unfavorably impressed by the austere and puritanical reputation of the town, and took a literary revenge by making it the scene of ribald adventures.[2]

Privileges of birth and wealth were not always sufficient to promote a man to the *fasces*. Distinction in the military or forensic field was an advantage. It is almost beyond the limits of possibility

---

disprove the notion that Petronius was a Gaul! Cf. M. Clero, *Masssalia* II (1929), 259f., Gaselee, *Materials* i. 41-3, and Peck's edition (59-61).

[1] Cf. page 45 above; Collignon, *Étude* 334-6; T. Mommsen, *H* 13 (1878), 106 n. 2; B.W. Henderson, *Nero* (1903), 490, and Brugnoli 317-9, 324, who happily suggests that "Arbiter" was introduced into Petronius' literary name in the times of the *poetae novelli*.

[2] The nature of the Massilia adventure is explained by C. Cichorius, *römische Studien* (1922), 438ff. Against, T. Birt, *PhW* 45 (1925), col. 95.

that Petronius was a military man; he may have had some talents as an orator of the Attic school, although he is critical of the rhetoric of his day, and introduced into the *Satyricon* at least one humorous courtroom scene (frr. 9, 15).

Tacitus implies that it was not the demonstration of such talents that brought Petronius to the fore: *hunc ignavia ad famam tulerat*, whilst others employed *industria*. *ignavia* here could have political implications; one of Tacitus' chief doctrines is the danger of possessing outstanding qualifications under the Julio-Claudians.[1] Tacitus also mentions his *species simplicitatis*; we may assume that Petronius quietly moved through the senatorial *cursus honorum*, without attracting attention to himself or becoming involved in dangerous political associations.[2]

Even if we allow for the value of family intrigues, it is improbable that Petronius can have risen so high if he was really inefficient. Obviously Tacitus realised that his behavior was shrewd; he acknowledges Petronius' ability in typically ambiguous words: *proconsul TAMEN Bithyniae et mox consul vigentem se ac parem negotiis OSTENDIT*—the surprise lay in Petronius' showing his efficiency. Tacitus pays him yet another grudging compliment: *dein revolutus ad vitia SEU VITIORUM IMITATIONE* . . . It is, therefore, apparent that Tacitus had a sneaking admiration for the man and was prepared to imply as much; he could not be more explicit about so un-Roman a Roman.[3]

Why did Petronius suddenly show his ability? Around 60 A.D. it must have been apparent that the domination of Nero by Seneca and Burrus could not last much longer, and that the young emperor would soon wish to assert himself as an independent ruler. It was also apparent that Nero was a lover of the Arts, and would welcome men of culture and refinement to his circle of friends. Petronius himself was a man of taste, and the prospect of being the focal point of such an artistic circle may have been tempting.

---

[1] For example, *Agric.* 6.3; *Hist.* 1.49 (Galba), *Ann.* 14.47 (Memmius Regulus).

[2] For a possible political implication of this, see O. Hiltbrunner, '*simplicitas* u. Kaisertum', *Latina Graeca* (1958), 61-84.

[3] Tacitus was aware that a loose private life did not imply inefficiency in public affairs. He records (*Ann.* 13.46) that Otho showed sterling qualities *after* his "exile" from the luxury of Rome and friendship with Nero, cf. *Ann.* 6.32 on L. Vitellius. Tacitus doubtless found these "paradoxes" more attractive than surprising.

It is possible, then, that he brought himself into prominence in order to attain this end; this is confirmed by Tacitus' reference to *vitiorum imitatio*; Petronius may have only pretended to be the possessor of *vitia*, one of which was *eruditus luxus*, and this would have been a pretence with some purpose behind it.

If this is so, then it is apparent that he calculated well, and achieved the eminence at court which he desired. Furthermore, his influence must have been still strong in 66 A.D., when he died; for Tacitus states that his fall was due to the jealousy of Tigellinus—sufficient testimony to Petronius' influence with Nero at the time.[1] Petronius' suicide implies that he was not over-sorry to bow himself out gracefully, still retaining his *species simplicitatis* while whimsically insulting Nero; but the fact that he travelled as far as Cumae in an attempt to speak with Nero shows that he still desired to remain in favor with the emperor.

This is perhaps surprising to us, as the Neronian Circle after 65 A.D. contained some dreadful people, such as Tigellinus, Vatinius, Sporus, and Halotus.[2] Only when he realised that he could not escape the consequences of Tigellinus' jealousy, *nec tulit ultra timoris aut spei moras*. It seems, then, to be implied by Tacitus that Petronius was a man of ability, who deliberately tried to be adopted as Nero's Arbiter of Elegance, and only resigned himself to the loss of this position when his situation had become hopeless.

This is a plausible outline of Petronius' career, but it might be possible to date his consulship more precisely. The years 60, 61 and 62 have been suggested as the most likely, with 63 as a possibility.[3] If it was 63, then his colleague Saturninus reached the senior proconsular command in the amazingly short time of eight years. Even if we allow for the disruption caused by the Civil War of 69-70, we then have to reckon with Petronius' starting the *Satyricon* in the latter part of 63, at the earliest.

---

[1] Petronius' friendship with the Epicurean Scaevinus was the ground of accusation; cf. *Ann.* 15.71: Novius Priscus was put to death *per amicitiam Senecae* in 65 A.D.

[2] See R. Waltz, *La vie politique de Sénèque* (1909), 442. It should of course be remembered that our impression of these people as *social* beings is affected by the censorious attitudes of our historical sources. The *Satyricon* is hardly the production of a morally censorious author.

[3] Brugnoli, *art. cit.*, 329 n. 35, dates Niger's consulship to 60 A.D.; Bagnani, *AE* 22, thinks that the *fasti* for 62 A.D. are complete.

Mason Hammond has advanced reasons for filling up the *fasti* for July 60 and 61 with other consuls: C. Velleius Paterculus and M. Manlius Vopiscus, and Cn. Pedanius Salinator and L. Velleius Paterculus.[1] If this is correct, then Niger was almost certainly consul in July 62.

There are two considerations to support this date. First, it squares well with the composition of the *Satyricon*; commencement in late 62 would allow the author to have reached Books XV-XVI in 64-5 A.D. without pressure. Second, the year 62 belongs to the period when the *fasti* were increasingly filled with the names of "persons who were supplanting Seneca and Burrus in the counsels of Nero".[2] For instance, Petronius' successor in the consulship would be Eprius Marcellus.

However, since Hammond's argument is not conclusive, the years 60 and 61 remain possible. 60 would be especially appropriate, to inaugurate the *Neronia.*

Tacitus says that Petronius was consul sometime after (*mox*) his governorship of Bithynia. The proconsul for 59/60 is known;[3] thus if Petronius was consul in 62, he can hardly have been proconsul in 58/9, whereas 60/61 or 61/62 are the most likely dates. Presumably the efficiency which he showed in Bithynia will have been in connexion with the Armenian War, since Bithynia was a very important province for supplying the armies on and beyond the Euphrates.[4]

Again, it might be possible to ascertain more precisely the date of Petronius' death. It must be before September 66 A.D., since Nero left for Greece on the 25th of that month, and he can hardly have had a holiday in Campania after August.[5] Tacitus' account of the year 66 (*Ann.* 16.14-24) seems to be in chronological order, since he is dealing throughout the passage with persecutions in Rome. In *Ann.* 16.24 the arrival of Tiridates is mentioned, and this can hardly be after May of 66. Further, we know that the holiday season at Baiae was March-April especially,[1] and Nero was presumably heading for the bay of Naples when Petronius committed suicide, which would put the date of his death between March and May of 66 A.D.

---

[1] Mason Hammond, *MAAR* 15 (1938), 28ff. Not firmly accepted by Degrassi, *Fasti Consolari* (1952), 18.

[2] R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958). 743. It is quite possible that Petronius Turpilianus (*ord.* 61 A.D.) had helped to promote his relative, Niger, to the consulship.

[3] This was M. Tarquitius Priscus, cf. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (1950), 1591.

[4] Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *ABSA* xxii (1916-18), 1ff; O. Cuntz, *H* 61 (1926), 192-202; F.A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War* (1948), 165ff.

[5] Departure for Greece, *CIL* VI 2044, cited by A. Momigliano, *CAH* X, 735 n. 1.

---

[1] Baiae: Suetonius, *Nero* 34.3; *RE* II, 2774-5.

CHAPTER THREE

PETRONIUS AND HIS LITERARY CONTEMPORARIES

1. PETRONIUS AND LUCAN

It appears then and will, I hope, become clearer that those parts of the *Satyricon* which we possess were written in the latter part of Nero's reign by the emperor's Arbiter of Elegance, and that the audience of the work must have been the small artistic circle with which Nero had surrounded himself. We may now examine the relation of Petronius to his two major literary contemporaries, Seneca and Lucan. Petronius, as we shall see, wrote at a time when Seneca's *Moral Epistles* were known and topical, and Petronius' poem on the Civil War has obvious affinities with Lucan's *Pharsalia*.[1] Seneca's other works are not much alluded to by Petronius,[2] and since we have lost Lucan's other poems it is impossible to determine whether Petronius referred to these as well as to the *Pharsalia*.

Examination of Petronius' use of these two Stoic works sheds much light on the date at which various passages of the *Satyricon* were written. A date can be deduced if it can be shown (a) to what extent Petronius knew all or part of these works, and (b) the date of their composition or publication. More precisely, we need to ascertain at what date Petronius and his audience can have been sufficiently familiar with these works for the allusions in the *Satyricon* to be worth making.

There is an objection which is often made (and often rightly) to any attempt to date an author by his use of other writings. This objection consists in stressing the possibility of coincidence or of a common linguistic or literary source, or else the possibility that the supposedly later writer might in fact on the evidence be the earlier. In the case of Petronius, the attempts of Paoli and Marmorale to make Petronius an adaptor of Martial, Apuleius, Fronto and Marcus Aurelius have been discussed and criticised earlier in these pages. In the case of Lucan and Seneca, however, the objection is not valid, because Petronius' echoes are humorous and sometimes flippant—which rules out the possibility of the serious Stoic writers gratefully accepting their themes from Petronius! As for the possible use of a common source, the details which now follow will show clearly enough how improbable that is.

---

[1] I call Lucan's poem the *Pharsalia* to avoid confusion with Petronius' *BC*. The actual title intended by Lucan is not certain, since it depends largely on the interpretation of 9.985-6 (*Pharsalia nostra/vivet*), cf. R.T. Bruère, *CP* 46 (1951), 111-5; E. Griset, *RSC* 2 (1954), 109ff. The wording of Lucan's prologue might indicate *Pharsalia* as the title, though the poem ends at roughly the same point as Caesar's *de bello civili* (3.112 *fin.*).

[2] For most of these "parallels", cf. Collignon, *Étude* 291ff.[Cf. also Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius* (1968), 139ff, 193ff.]

We may consider first the adaptation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* which Eumolpus delivers in 119-124. It has been almost universally recognised that Lucan is the poet whom Petronius has in mind, although, as we might expect, there has been a bewildering difference of opinion concerning the purpose of this adaptation.

Before reciting his poem on the Civil War, Eumolpus delivers a lecture on the proper writing of epic poetry. The reader of the *Satyricon* already knows at this point that Eumolpus is a farcical old bore, a moral hypocrite and poetaster; but Petronius, in his whimsical way, has put into his mouth sentiments not unworthy of a serious literary critic. The speech begins *multos . . . carmen decepit.* Eumolpus continues in the past tense, criticising those who by using metre competently and devising delicate phrases think that they have written poetry; he goes on to mention those who turn from forensic oratory and rhetorical practice to poetry, as if to something easier. He now changes to the present tense and makes some points about empty phrases and a lack of wide reading, vulgarisms, and glittering *sententiae*; his conclusion is that avoidance of these faults is given to few. He then becomes more specific: *ecce, belli civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit, nisi plenus litteris sub onere labetur,* and then he mentions the need for inspiration and the use of divine machinery in the treatment of historical themes. Finally, he declares his intention to recite a version of his own, *etiamsi nondum recepit ultimam manum,* to illustrate his view.

Some other information about this recitation is relevant here. According to the MSS, Eumolpus (124.2) boomed out his poem *ingenti volubilitate verborum,* and that before he had begun his lecture Corax and Giton had struck up an unpleasant chorus of noise (*obscenus strepitus,* 117.12).

Thus what Eumolpus says has reference to the young poet who has had a career in oratory, and whose forensic studies have seriously affected his poetic competence:[1] who shows a lack of wide reading, and has underestimated the size of such an undertaking as an epic poem on the Civil War, in which the traditional divine machinery has not been used, but which is the bald and scientific account of the sober historian, put into verse.

All these charges are appropriate to Lucan especially.[2] Since Lucan was a contemporary, and the poem which Eumolpus recites is full of echoes of the *Pharsalia*, it cannot really be doubted that chapter 118 was written with Lucan in mind.[3] Furthermore, it is obvious that what Petronius says about Lucan is to be taken as criticism, even if it is intentionally "bad" criticism. Perhaps even the very hasty and extemporaneous nature of Eumolpus' unfinished *opus* is relevant, as Lucan could extemporise and also wrote at great speed.[4]

Finally, it is possible to suppose that Petronius made Corax and Giton "accompany" Eumolpus' diatribe for more than simple knockabout humour. It so happens that Lucan, when out of favour with Nero, quoted a phrase of the Emperor's: *sub terris tonuisse putes*,[5] after letting slip an obscene noise in the public lavatories in Rome. It is just conceivable that Petronius retaliates to Lucan's insulting action by introducing the same accompaniment for his own "Lucanic" poem, although we have no way of knowing how large a lacuna follows 117.13.

But this latter point is not the only reason for believing that Petronius is making fun of Lucan, and that he is not in sympathy with the young poet. Apart from the humorous setting of the whole poem, there are several passages in the poem itself where the incongruous adaptation of certain passages in Lucan implies that the Arbiter of Elegance was in fact mocking as well as criticising.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Mössler's commentary on the *BC* (1842) 3, following Goldast 545/706.

[2] Cf. the charges of Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.90, Fronto 157N, and Servius, *Aen.* 1.382; compare Granius Licinianus 36 on Sallust; E. Norden, *NJKA* 7 (1901), 313; H. P. Syndikus, *Lucans Gedicht vom Burgerkrieg* (1958), 27-9.

[3] First observed by Pithou 547/708, cf. Goldast, *ibid*, and denied only by Beck, whose arguments are weak, and by M. Souriau, *De deorum ministeriis in Pharsalia* (1885), 80. Cf. most recently O. Seel, *RhM* 103 (1960), 264.

[4] Cf. Burman 532/689 on 115.4; Lucan once extemporized an *Orpheus*.

[5] For the anecdote, cf. Suetonius' *vita Lucani*.

[6] Mössler argues for parody, followed by H. Genthe, *De Lucani vita et scriptis* (1859), 22; Westerberg prefers to call it "*Travestie*". More moderate, e.g., A. Monti, *Nuovi studi petroniani* (1907). Ambivalent, W.E. Heitland,

Petronius' dependence on Lucan's *Pharsalia* is clearly shown not only from his use of Lucan's phrases and style but also from his adaptation of the subject-matter. Petronius describes only the prelude to the actual fighting of the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey. The first sixty lines are a comment on the moral degeneration of Rome and the growth of luxury as a cause of the War: the fact that it is Eumolpus who recites this, and that several anachronisms are discernible in the passage, precludes us from believing that Petronius meant this seriously. Only six lines are devoted to the development and crisis of the first Triumvirate (61-6); and purely political causes are subordinated to a long description of the terrific Powers of Hell and Evil (67-143). Caesar's crossing of the Alps, and his speech after the crossing, are next given in a long passage (144-208), which draws upon Livy as well as Lucan. Following this, Petronius describes the panic and confusion at Rome and elsewhere, when the news of Caesar's invasion arrives (209-44); and the poem ends with another spectacular description of the supernatural Powers of destruction setting the grim events of the War in motion (245-94).

Thus in less than 300 lines Petronius has included most of the action covered in Lucan's first Book (the evidence is more fully set out in Appendix B.) But, as Mössler pointed out, Petronius' treatment is very different.[1] He skips over the political causes of the fighting between Pompey and Caesar, and is apparently less hostile to Caesar than Lucan is. On the other hand, Lucan, in the first Book at any rate, plays down the Sallustian view that Rome was undermined by the moral degeneration of her citizens in political and private life—whereas Petronius, as we have seen, incongruously allows Eumolpus to stress the growth of luxury and degeneration.

Furthermore, Petronius produces a whole host of rather unusual divinities who influence the course of historical events. These divinities may strike the modern reader as rather ridiculous,[2]

---

in the introduction to Haskins' edition § 31, followed by Gaselee and Baldwin. For 118 as serious criticism, B. Misner, *EPhK* 61 (1938), 99ff; A. F. Sochatoff, *TAPA* 93 (1962), 449ff. E. Trampe, *De Lucani arte metrica* (1884), 78, thinks that Petronius parodies Lucan's prosody. For a Marxist discussion, see N.M. Santrossian, *BCO* 8(1963), 92. [See now Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 165ff.]

[1] J. G. Mössler, *Quaestionum petr. specimen* 1 (1857).

[2] Petronius, like Lucan, omits the Olympian divinities, but he inserts "Stoic" concepts and personifications. Thus he bases his "own" divine

but at all events it is clear that Petronius, in accordance with the precepts of 118, carefully avoids anything resembling a scientific historical analysis.

It is remarkable that Petronius has been able to introduce so many echoes of Lucan into a poem which, while it covers most of Lucan's subject-matter, has adapted Lucan's order of scenes so much. As we would expect, Petronius has contrived to place his echoes of Lucan in a context different from the one from which he takes them. The effect is sometimes almost comical (see the full series of adaptations set out in Appendix B). Unfortunately, some scholars have extravagantly claimed as echoes lines that might easily depend on a common source or on pure accident; in these pages, only the more striking parallels have been quoted, although the others are listed.

From a study of the parallel passages, it emerges clearly that Petronius knew the first three Books of the *Pharsalia* well enough, and believed his audience to know them well enough, for him to be able to adapt Lucan in the expectation that his audience would appreciate the allusions, and also be amused by the way in which Petronius has altered the contexts of his borrowings.

Before we proceed further with the argument, it is necessary to clear up a point which has been the source of some confusion. In Appendix B it will be noticed that the great majority of the probable echoes in Petronius are from the first three Books of the *Pharsalia*, and most of these are from Book I. It has therefore often been thought that Petronius knew *only* these books and that the other parallels are fortuitous. But, as Lejay points out,[1] Petronius is dealing with the subject-matter of Lucan's first Book only; and thus whether Petronius knew the whole of the *Pharsalia* or not, we would expect that most of the parallels would come from the Book which Petronius is manipulating. None the less, it is certainly not a valid conclusion from the evidence in Appendix B that Petronius knew the whole of the *Pharsalia*. What does emerge is that he knew Book One very well indeed, and had at least *heard* the first three Books.

---

machinery upon Lucan's omission of it. Petronius does however follow Lucan in omitting an invocation to the Muses. [In some ways Petronius looks forward to Statius, who also tends to introduce abstract personifications among his deities.]

[1] P. Lejay, lxxiii n.2.

We may now turn to a piece of evidence which has escaped all who have studied the problem. Stubbe on *BC* 293 refers to Lucan 10.543-6, for the incidence in both cases of the word Epidamnus.[1] Let us consider the final passages of Petronius' *BC* and of the *Pharsalia*:

BC 290-4:

> "Quid porro tu, dive, tuis cunctaris in armis?
> non frangis portas, non muris oppida solvis
> thesaurosque rapis? nescis tu, Magne, tueri
> Romanas arces? Epidamni moenia quaere,
> Thessalicosque sinus humano sanguine tingue".

Compare Lucan 10.540-6:

> non acie fusa nec magnae stragis acervis
> vincendus tum Caesar erat, sed sanguine nullo.
> captus sorte loci pendet; dubiusque timeret
> optaretne mori respexit in agmine denso
> Scaevam perpetuae meritum iam nomina famae
> ad campos, Epidamne, tuos, ubi solus apertis
> obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum.

It is immediately obvious that the Petronius passage recalls the *Pharsalia* passage. Both deal with a similar situation; the hesitation of great generals. In both we find a mention of Epidamnus; *muri* and *moenia* are in both passages, as is the mention of *Magnus*, and a few other coincidences. Both are in the form of an apostrophe. Is all this fortuitous? If it is, it is an amazing coincidence that the *final* passage in Petronius' poem, itself clearly based on the *Pharsalia*, echoes the *final* passage of the *Pharsalia*. It is therefore difficult to resist the conclusion that Petronius wrote the last lines of the *BC* with Lucan's passage in mind and knew it to be the final passage of the *Pharsalia*.[2] This offers a possible clue to the date at which Petronius completed his *BC*; it cannot have been written until the time when Petronius learned that the *Pharsalia* ends where it does.

I have discussed elsewhere the chronological problems presented by Lucan's career,[1] and all that need be done here is to summarize my conclusions. Lucan died on April 30, 65. Statius' evidence (*Silv.* 2.7) suggests that the *Pharsalia* is to be associated with the last few months of Lucan's life, and it was probably after Lucan's poem on the Great Fire of Rome (late July 64). Whether or not we adopt the assumption that the work was substantially complete at Lucan's death or would have been carried further, the 8060 lines of the extant unrevised poem could have been written in this period by Lucan's averaging less than 30 lines a day, no great feat for a poet whose exceptional speed of composition is noted by the ancient authorities. According to Vacca's life (335.25 Hosius), Lucan had published only three books of the *Pharsalia,* when his further publication was halted by the order of Nero. Vacca implies that it was the fame of these three books which gained him the emperor's enmity. Cassius Dio (62.29.4) dates the ban to 65 A.D., and Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.49) records that Lucan joined the Pisonian conspiracy in the same year. Books 1-3, on which Petronius mainly relies, are very favourable in their references to Nero, but Books 4-6 are no more anti-imperial than they, and seem just as complete. It would appear, then, that these were almost ready for publication when the ban came, and that the angry tones of Books 7-9, as well as their greater length, may be explained by Lucan's insertion into them, and perhaps also into Book 10, of passages expressing his resentment. Creative, rather than pruning, work on them occupied the last few months of Lucan's life. The lack of a clear division between Books 9 and 10 is presumably due to the same cause.

---

[1] Burman 595/769 also cites this, and 2. 624.

[2] It is significant also that the first two lines of the *BC* echo passages from the beginning of Lucan's first Book, especially 1.110. See further R. J. Getty *CQ* 30 (1936), 55-6; *CP* 46 (1951), 25-31; against, W. H. Semple, *CQ* 31 (1937), 16-7; R. T. Bruère, *CP* 44 (1949), 244ff.

Now if these conclusions are acceptable, then Petronius could have known no more than the first three books of the *Pharsalia* before Lucan's death: for only these were published, that is to say, had been recited publicly or were on sale at bookshops. It is impossible for Petronius to have known of Lucan's tenth book from such sources, although he might have done so from a private recitation or a privately distributed copy. But it is very unlikely that Lucan would have allowed copies of his later books to have been read by the Neronian circle after his quarrel with Nero, and obviously Nero's friends would not have been welcome at any private recitations he might give. Therefore, as Lucan must have written the final passage of his epic after his quarrel with Nero, Petronius' *BC*, at least in its final version or the version that we have, will date to sometime (soon rather than late) after April 65 A.D., although Petronius could of course have composed most of the poem with full knowledge of only the first three books of the *Pharsalia*. Probably the Arbiter of Elegance would have reacted swiftly to the appearance of such an important new work as this and the parody would have been begun soon after publication proper of Lucan's first three books.

---

[1] 'Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career', *TAPA* 97 (1966), 379, and also *CQ n.s.* 12 (1962), 166ff.

There are of course possible objections to this account. But even if the *Pharsalia* was left substantially as Lucan intended it to appear, the chronological evidence makes it unlikely that Petronius knew of Lucan's "ending" long before 65. Even if we date the actual composition of Lucan 10.540ff to the second half of 64, so intimately is Petronius (and therefore his audience) acquainted with the first book, published late in 64, that the *BC* can hardly have been completed before 65. Moreover, it is improbable that Lucan will have recited from an unfinished book as early as 64. And finally, since it is clear that the tenth book is to some extent unfinished, there was no guarantee that Lucan did not intend to compose a different ending while revising, and this would spoil what Petronius had in mind.[1]

Some shreds of further evidence may be offered to show that Petronius completed the *BC* after Lucan's death. The introduction to the poem provides some help. It was noted earlier that the *strepitus obscenus* introduced into the Giton-Corax scene might be an answer to Lucan's insulting behaviour towards Nero, which must have occurred after the quarrel, not more than a few months before Lucan's death. But further, 118 reads very much as if the criticism of Lucan, though he is not named, is criticism of a dead poet. Apart from general precepts, Eumolpus uses the past tense (*multos iuvenes carmen decepit*), although this must not be pressed too far; and his allusion to those who have forsaken the law-courts might be an oblique reference to the ban on Lucan's oratory. The phrases *belli civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit . . . sub onere labetur* and *nondum recepit ultimam manum* sound distinctly sinister.

---

[1] One must not overlook one implication of these arguments: one or more copies of the last seven books of the Pharsalia must have come in 65 A.D. into the hands of people outside Lucan's circle of friends. Whether Nero allowed a proper "publication" or not we cannot tell; he had squelched Lucan's *fama* while Lucan was alive (Tac. *Ann.* 16.49), but he was usually tolerant of outspoken writings (Suet. *Nero* 39.2), but he also feared artistic rivals (*ibid.* 23.5). He was hard on Antistius (Tac. *Ann.* 14.49, a political offence) and Cornutus (Dio 62.29.2-3). [Clearly Nero's attitudes varied, and no doubt the fame of the poem would be a great stimulus for its overt or covert circulation. Naturally Petronius' implicit and explicit criticism would be reassuring for him.]

Against this view, which has never been properly expressed, is set the bald declaration that Lucan must have been alive, because Petronius does not mention him by name and does not attack the dead. This has no cogency at all. As far as we can tell, Petronius, perhaps for artistic reasons, does not name any notable contemporaries except popular entertainers. I therefore conclude that the final version of 118-124 was written after April 65; probably to be topical, soon after.

We have now secured a *terminus post quem.* But of course Petronius may have written the *BC* as late as 66 A.D. However, since we might expect him to have introduced his Lucanic episode into the *Satyricon* soon after Lucan's death, it is justifiable to look for other allusions in the following chapters. It so happens that one exists in chapter 128, where we have some verses on the τόπος of frustrating dreams. Much of the imagery of this poem is derived from the subject of seeking (and not finding) buried treasures of gold. It is very tempting to take this as an allusion to the famous treasure-hunt in North Africa in mid-summer 65, when Caesellius Bassus appeared in Rome (probably in the spring) and announced that he had found the fabled treasures of Queen Dido. This was close to Nero's heart (he was short of money because of his extravagance) and he ordered a thorough search to be made. Obviously several weeks would elapse before a search for a treasure so important could be abandoned, and thus the news of its failure can hardly have been known in Rome before mid-summer. If we accept that Petronius is referring to this event in 128, then we can date that chapter to mid-summer 65 or a little later, and the completion of the *BC* will be between May and July 65.

It has been accepted by many scholars that Petronius *does* allude to the Bassus scandal, but they have not shown that Petronius probably wrote the last twenty-five chapters of the *Satyricon* not long after Lucan's death, which makes the argument doubly convincing.

2. Petronius and Seneca

It would seem then that chapters 118-124 of the *Satyricon* were written after April 65. In Appendix B some evidence is offered that Petronius may have introduced into earlier chapters occasional echoes of the *Pharsalia*, but this gives us no help for dating the composition of chapters 1-117 of the *Satyricon*. For this, however, it might be possible to obtain some evidence from Petronius' use of Seneca's writings.

Petronius of course is fond of referring to certain Stoic themes, and scholars have assembled a large list of echoes or parallels between the *Satyricon* and Seneca's philosophical works.[1] However, this work has usually been done with the intention of demonstrating that Petronius' Latin is contemporary, or nearly contemporary, with that of Seneca; and such a conclusion would need much qualification to be of value.

Not many scholars have examined the question with an eye to showing thoroughly the extent to which Petronius uses Senecan doctrines for his own literary purposes. Of those who have made such an attempt, Gottschlich tried to show instances of parody in the *Satyricon*; but Collignon pointed out that the relevant passages were mostly commonplaces.[2] Although enough work has been published to show clearly that Petronius *does* adapt Seneca in a humorous way, this aspect of the *Satyricon* has never been satisfactorily used to obtain a more precise dating of the work; scholars have been too hard put to it to prove the Neronian date.

Of the parallels which are worth considering, a large number comes from the *Epistulae Morales*. The reason for this is, that, at the time when the *Satyricon* was being composed, Seneca's letters were also being written and published. They would be, in fact, for Petronius' audience, the most familiar and the most topical of Seneca's works.[3] Therefore, if we can date as precisely as possible the composition of the Senecan *Epistles* which Petronius seems to have known, we shall obtain a *terminus post quem* for those passages of the *Satyricon* which employ phrases and doctrines from the *Epistles.*

---

[1] Studer 73, 89-91; Gaselee, *Materials* i. 36-8; Paratore (1933), I. 24 n.3; Schnur 123-34; for the *Apocolocyntosis*, Bagnani *AE* 80-82. See also Sullivan, *op. cit.* 125ff, 193ff.

[2] J. Gotschlich, 'De parodiis Senecae apud Petronium' (1863); answered by Collignon, *Étude* 291-303.

[3] It has sometimes been thought that Seneca "replies" to Petronius in the *Epistles*. But the letters directly attacking Petronius and his friends (114 and 122) do not imply that Seneca knew of the *Satyricon*. [See now J. P. Sullivan, 'Petronius, Lucan, and Seneca: A Neronian Literary Feud?' *TAPA* 99 (1968), 453-467.] It has also been thought that Seneca's phrase

There exists a certain amount of dispute over the dating of the letters, although the years 62-5 A.D. have not often been rejected. The relevant facts are unfortunately few. In the earlier *Epistles*, a constantly stressed subject is Seneca's retirement from public life; it is most emphatically stated in 8.2: *secessi non tantum ab hominibus, sed a rebus, et imprimis a meis rebus.* We may note also frequent references to Seneca's poor health and advanced age. The *secessio* mentioned in *Ep.* 8 cannot be a holiday, since Seneca appears to be "unemployed" all through the *Epistles.* Since Seneca withdrew from administration and government in 62 A.D.,[1] it is certain that the *Epistles* were commenced after that date.

There are some references in the *Epistles* to the time of year at which certain letters were written:

18.1 *December est mensis*;
23.1 . . . *quam humane nobiscum hiemps egerit* . . . *quam malignum ver sit*;
67.1 *ver aperire se coepit, sed iam inclinatum in aestatem*;
86.16 *Iunius mensis est* . . . *iam proclivis in Iulium*;
104.1 The reference to *febris*, and the unpleasantness of city life at the time of writing, implies the late summer or autumn (cf. Juv. 4.57-9);
122.1 *detrimentum iam dies sensit.*

Certain other references might indicate the time of writing. In 77.1 there is a mention of the corn-fleet from Egypt arriving at Puteoli. The usual time for its arrival would be the summer, before July; but we hear of ships sailing from Egypt in the autumn.[2] *Ep.* 91 dates to after the Fire of Rome, since it mentions a disaster at Lugdunum which occurred after July 64.[3] In this same letter

---

luxuriae et voluptatum arbiter (*Vit. Beat.* 6.1) alludes to Petronius; but if we consider the context of this phrase, it appears improbable.

[1] *Ann.* 14.52-6: van Wouweren (9/3) connects the phrase *studia* . . . *in umbra educata* (*Ann.* 14.53) with Petronius' *umbraticus doctor.* Observe also the hints in *Ep.* 14.7-8.

[2] Cf. A.C. Johnson, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* II (1936), 401; M.P. Charlesworth, *Trade-routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire* (1926), 23.

[3] As may be deduced from *Ann.* 16.13; cf. O. Hirschfeld, *RhM* 52 (1897/8), 294-6.

are passages which seem to refer to the Fire of Rome also: 91.1, 13 (cf. 94.16). The same date, late summer 64 or later, is also indicated by the reference to world peace in 91.2: *ubique armis quiescentibus, cum toto orbe terrarum diffusa pax sit.*

The other reference which is of help to establish the date is in 70.26, where Seneca mentions *secundo naumachiae spectaculo,* which ought to be that of 64 A.D.; the previous spectacle was in 57.[1]

Since *Ep.* 91 was written after July 64, *Ep.* 104 in late summer, and *Ep.* 122 in the second half of September or a little later, it is almost certain that the June referred to in *Ep.* 86 is that of 64 A.D. also. Therefore the spring mentioned in *Ep.* 67 is the spring of 64. However, is the spring mentioned in *Ep.* 67 the same spring as that in *Ep.* 23? Almost certainly not: there are references to delay in the correspondence in 38.1, 48.1 and 50.1, the last mentioning a very long delay. So it is best to assume that the spring noticed in *Ep.* 23 is the spring of 63 A.D., and therefore the December of *Ep.* 18 is the December of 62, which is what we should expect. Seneca commenced his letters, with their stress on his retirement and political harmlessness, not long after his withdrawal from the Neronian government.

This dating is the dating usually accepted, although various weak arguments have been imported into the discussion from time to time.[2] Binder, however, argued that the letters were started in late 63, and that they were often sent in large bundles to Lucilius. The only point in favour of this theory is the fact that Seneca does not mention the earthquake of Pompeii in the *Epistles*;[3] but this is *ex silentio,* and in any case the earthquake may have occurred in 62 A.D.[4]

It has sometimes been thought that, since Seneca says the Lugdunum disaster occurred one hundred years after the city's foundation, the date of *Ep.* 91 should be 58 A.D., which gives the required interval of time.[1] But surely Seneca gives only a round number; in any case, Seneca was not in retirement in 58.

---

[1] *Naumachia* of 57 A.D., Dio 61.9.5, of 64 A.D., Dio 62.15.1. Unfortunately, we do not know the date of Annaeus Serenus' death, *Ep.* 63.14, Plin. *NH* 22.96; cf. H. Dessau, *H* 53 (1918), 188ff.

[2] See the enormously industrious article of H. Hilgenfeld, *FleckeisenJ Supp.* 17 (1890), 601ff.

[3] He might be "expected" to do so in *Ep.* 49.1, 70.1.

[4] 63 A.D. is the date given by Seneca, *NQ* 6.1.2; but Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.22) gives 62 A.D., which has received considerable support: cf. Mason Hammond, *MAAR* 15 (1938), 28-32; G. Onorato, *RAL* (1949) 644ff.

A more fundamental objection to the date of composition established above is, that the *Epistles* are a literary work, intended for publication, and hence references to the weather, time of year and so on are merely devices to make the *Epistles* sound like genuine letters rather than simply moral treatises in letter-form.[2] It is quite clear that Seneca *did* intend that the *Epistles* should be published, but there is no reason to suppose that they were not addressed to Lucilius, and, at least initially, sent to him. Even less is there reason to doubt that the allusions to the time of year reflect the time of writing, especially since these allusions square with the other evidence for the date of composition.

It appears, then, that *Ep.* 86 was written in late June, 64; *Ep.* 91 in July-August, *Ep.* 104 in late summer or early autumn, and *Ep.* 122 in September-October of the same year.

For the dating of the *Satyricon,* Petronius' use of Senecan works other than the *Epistles* does not produce any valuable evidence; nor can we date Seneca's other works with as much precision. Therefore we shall now consider to what extent the date of the *Epistles* is relevant to the date of certain passages in the *Satyricon.*

I have observed about eighty parallels between the two works which catch the eye; however, much of this is simply coincidence of philosophical themes, such as "all the world's a stage", condemnations of luxury, and moral standpoints. It is especially interesting to observe how Petronius uses words like *bonitas, frugalitas* and *bona mens* in a less dignified context.[3] But a full treatment of this subject is not sufficiently relevant to the date of the *Satyricon* for inclusion here.[4]

A few of the more significant parallels may be appropriately set out, although it is well to bear in mind once more the possibility of a common source.

---

[1] Interval of 100 years, *Ep.* 91.14. "One hundred years" is better rhetorically than "a hundred and six years".

[2] A question much disputed since Lipsius. The most sensible judgement is that of R. Pichon, *JS* 1912, pp. 222-5: Seneca had publication in mind, but he writes as to a friend not well-versed in Stoicism, and at least some of the earlier letters were actually sent.

[3] *bonitas, Ep.* 34.3, *Sat.* 140.2,7; *frugalitas, Ep.*17.5, *Sat.* 84.5, and so on. The Odysseus-motif in the *Satyricon* might have enabled Petronius to allude to the Stoic idea of Odysseus (cf. Sen. *Const. Sap.* 2.1.), but this is not to be found in the extant fragments. [See now Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 125ff, 193ff.]

[4] On this cf. Delatte, *BAB* 36 (1950), 95ff.

Ep. 8.8, *Sat.* 55.5: the literary qualities of Publilius Syrus; both Seneca and Trimalchio (!) use the word *disertus.*

Ep. 12.8, *Sat.* 52.9, 78.5: a mock-funeral scene; but Seneca refers to the same sort of thing in *Brev. Vit.* 20.3, and both Petronius and Seneca may have heard of Pacuvius from an independent source.[1]

Ep. 27.5, *Sat.* 48.4, 50.5, cf. 66.1: Sabinus' aping of culture; here again, Sabinus himself, rather than Seneca's comment, may be Petronius' "source".

Ep. 40.2, *Sat.* 76.10: the names of "philosophers", Serapa, Serapio; this was pointed out by Heinsius 382/495, but Burman's objection to the identification (*ibid.*) still has some value.

Ep. 47.1,10, *Sat.* 70.11-71.7: here there is a definite echo of Seneca for comic effect; Trimalchio is usually harsh to slaves, but when drunk, he trots out in appalling Latin Seneca's high-minded reflections on the brotherhood of man.[2]

Ep. 47.9, *Sat.* 47.11: slaves organised in *decuriae.* But a similar reference is found in *de Tranqu.* 8.6.

Ep. 88.44, *Sat.* 56.7: the phrase *de negotio deicere.* The TLL observes that the sense is different in the two passages,[3] but the phrase is not found elsewhere, and in the Petronian passage it is the *philosophi* who are put out of business! It seems possible, therefore, that the Petronian phrase is an echo of Seneca's.

Epp. 94.68-9, 100.5, 8, 108.10, 114.8, *Sat.* 118: examination of the Senecan passages reveal that the rather breathless doctrines with which Eumolpus prefaces the *BC* have a surprising number of parallels with Seneca's views on literature. But it is not of course certain that Petronius was definitely alluding to these passages in the *Epistles.*

Ep. 95.43, *Sat.* 116.9: *heredipetae* are compared to crows; perhaps a common image. [Juvenal's twelfth satire is significantly addressed to Corvinus.]

---

[1] Amazingly, the Senecan passage was cited by Pithou 125/170, who did not know the passages contained only in the *Traguriensis.*

[2] Once again, Pithoeus (97/132) divined that Petronius had Seneca's letters in mind while composing his portrait of Trimalchio.

[3] *TLL* V 400. 34-6, 45-7.

I have counted 33 possible echoes of Seneca's *Epistles* in the *BC* itself of which several cannot be used as argument. But of these 33, nine come from *Epp.* 29-86, five from *Epp.* 108-22, whereas nineteen come from *Epp.* 89-95. Furthermore, all of these echoes except four occur in the first 90 lines of the *BC*.[1]

There is then a fair indication that Petronius had read *Epp.* 89 onwards when he completed the *BC* and chapter 118, which is some confirmation of the date at which we arrived earlier (see pp. 67-68).

For chapters 1-117 of the *Satyricon*, the possible echoes of Seneca do not provide us with very firm evidence for the date. It is for this reason that I have not listed at length the eighty-odd parallels; to argue firmly from them would be to ignore the possibility of coincidence or a common source in each case. But it is clear enough that Petronius intentionally echoed *Ep.* 47, and thus we have a *terminus post* of, say, mid-63 A.D. for the *Cena*. It is unfortunate that we do not know when *Ep.* 47 was published, or available to Petronius and his audience. If we could be sure that the phrase *iam etiam philosophos de negotio deiciebat* is an echo of Seneca, then we would have a *terminus post* of July 64 A.D. for the *Cena*.

However, it is perhaps unwise to force the above conclusions. At least, we have some confirmation of the argument from Petronius' use of Seneca, that the *later* chapters of the *Satyricon* were written after April 65 A.D.

---

[1] It would take far too much space to list the details with full and appropriate discussion; but the statistics even before analysis might have some significance. Some examples: 71.8-9, *BC* 45, 65-7; 90.7, *BC* 87-8, 34-5; 90.18, *BC* 6ff, 16; 90.45, *BC* 10, 18, 24ff; 94.58, *BC* 58; 95.24, *BC* 28. We might have to make allowance for unconscious reminiscence on Petronius' part.

CHAPTER FOUR

PETRONIUS AND NERONIAN SOCIETY

1. Allusions to Events of 60-65 A.D.

So far we have seen that Petronius reacted to the appearance of Lucan's *Pharsalia* by inserting into the *Satyricon* a critical pastiche of Lucan. As Arbiter of Elegance, he passed judgement on an important new literary work, just as he seems to have passed judgement on the philosophy of Seneca's *Letters*. Possibly there might have been other notices of contemporary literature and thought, but most of that literature has been lost.

The *Satyricon*, as is well known, is realistic in its depiction of the Mediterranean world of the author's day, and, not surprisingly, Petronius alludes also to particular events of interest to himself and his audience: apart from the appearance of the *Pharsalia*, one might cite once more the treasures of Dido and Caesellius Bassus (88. 8, 128). It remains to be seen whether various other events of the years 64-5 A.D. are alluded to in the *Satyricon*.

In chapter 89, Eumolpus recites a poem on the *Troiae Halosis*. As this chapter was written around January 65, it is of roughly the same date as Nero's poem on the same subject and with perhaps even that title. Probably then Petronius deliberately chose the Fall of Troy as the subject of Eumolpus' clever poem. But we should not be at all justified in deducing that Petronius' poem constitutes a satire on Nero or his poetry. The *TH* is, in style, most akin to that of Seneca in his dramatic works, but unless sufficient portions of Nero's own poem were recovered, no decision could be reached as to what extent the *TH* is an imitation of Nero's style. Indeed it is difficult to see how the *TH* could be a parody of Nero's poetry, which appears to have been elegant and Alexandrian.[1]

If the dating of the *Satyricon* argued in these pages is accepted, the remarks of Encolpius and Eumolpus on painting and sculpture were written at the time when Nero's agents were ransacking Greece for similar works of art to replace those lost in the Fire of Rome. Here again, the Petronius passage might have been inspired by the arrival of *objets-d'art* in Rome, many of them destined for the *domus aurea.*[1] The reference to a painting not yet destroyed by age (83.1) might have reference to the fact that Nero had to replace a faded painting by Apelles, substituting one by Dorotheus.[2]

---

[1] For parody, H. Bardon, *Les empereurs et les lettres latines* (1940), 246; J. van IJzeren, *Hermeneus* 25 (1954), 115ff; more cautious, Schnur 107f, and others. For the title *halosis*, Suet. *Nero* 38.6, cf. *TLL* VI 2520.18-20; Dio 62.18.1, 29.1 (compare the title of Tryphiodorus' Ἅλωσις Ἰλίου). See now G. Scheda, *Hist.* 16 (1967), 111-5.

Grenade has demonstrated at great length that the references in the *BC* to extravagant building projects allude to various undertakings of Nero; this is now all the more probable once the date of the composition of the *BC* has been established. Furthermore, it is easier to accept the view that the Golden House is also referred to, since it was being built at the same time as the *BC* was being composed.[3]

Here again, although it is probable that Petronius alludes to these Neronian projects, it cannot be deduced that Petronius is criticising or satirising the emperor. The remarks in the *BC*, like the rest of Eumolpus' moralizing, are in a context that implies laughter rather than reproof; nor could it be maintained that Petronius intended to chide Nero for bringing art-treasures of Greece to Rome.

There are some notable events of the early 60's which seem to be referred to in the *Satyricon.* Agamemnon's preaching against the seeking for applause on the stage (5.7-8) could easily be a light-hearted reference to Nero's *Augustiani*, a trained body of *claqueurs* who applauded the emperor. Eumolpus' tasteless poem on the subject of hair (109.9-10) reminds us of Nero's poem on Poppaea's (but also Ovid's, of course); and the reference (126.7) to the fourteen rows of seats reserved for *equites* might have been inspired by the re-enactment of a law on the subject not long before the date of this passage. Finally, the horrid condition of Eumolpus' will, commanding his legatees to eat his body in public

---

[1] *NH* 34.84: statues, *violentia Neronis in urbem convecta et in sellariis domus aureae disposita.*

[2] *NH* 35.91 (an *Aphrodite Anadyomene*).

[3] Full evidence in P. Grenade, *REA* 1 (1948) 272ff, although Grenade's dating-logic is insufficient.

(141.2), might have been written about the time an Egyptian cannibal was drawing attention at the Neronian court.[1]

Such allusions of course cannot be considered anything like certain. But it is fair to point out that an examination of the notable events of the years 64-5 A.D. shows that a surprising number of them have a parallel in what we possess of the *Satyricon*, which was written in those years. Fuller knowledge of the historical events of that time might well elucidate certain puzzling passages in the *Satyricon*, and probably the lost books also contained allusions, perhaps humorous or ironical, to other notable contemporary events.

2. Allusions to the Emperor

With the allusions to persons of note we are on rather firmer ground. In arguing for the Neronian dating earlier, we detected sure references to two popular entertainers, the gladiator Petraites and the singer Menecrates, as well as possible references to a few other persons. Now that the dating of the *Satyricon* has been more accurately pinpointed, it might be well to go over some of this ground again from a different point of view, in particular to analyse more carefully the supposed references to Nero, which are listed in full in Appendix A. Many of these are impossible, some are improbable, but since it has been argued without reference to these that the *Satyricon* was written for the Neronian circle, it is legitimate to suppose that parallels between Nero's habits and the *Satyricon* would have been immediately noticed as such by Petronius' audience.

It is not an accident that so many such items have been collected. Scholars who held the "*codicilli*" view have been much maligned; but though their deductions were at fault, their close examination of the evidence for Nero's personal habits has at least made it clear that the parallels between this evidence and the *Satyricon* are too numerous to be ignored.[2]

What is especially striking is the fact that almost all the reasonably likely parallels occur in the *Cena*. Those that do not have been noted above: the *plausores*, the *Troiae Halosis*, the poem on hair, and the Egyptian cannibal. On the other hand, at least fifteen passages in the *Cena* remind us of Nero, and all of these concern the portrait of Trimalchio. Some of these may be listed for closer examination.

---

[1] *Augustiani*, *Ann.* 14.15; Poppaea's hair, *NH* 37.50; fourteen rows, *Ann.* 15.32; Egyptian cannibal, Suet. *Nero* 37.4.

[2] On the whole question, cf. Q. Picari, *La figura di Trimalchione* (1910).

For example, Trimalchio's manner of dress (27.2, etc.) and favourite colours (28.4, 8) are similar to those of Nero; and his steward, like the emperor, dislikes wearing the same clothes more than once (30.11). Among Trimalchio's personal possessions is a *pyxis aurea* (29.8), an *armilla aurea* (32.4), and an astronomical design (30.4). He keeps a group of *cursores* (28.4, 29.7), he likes having a lot of cushions (32.1-2, 59.3, 78.5); he is fond of the music of water-organs (36.6), and of using coloured "sawdust" (68.1-2); and he cannot bear the discussions of philosophers (71.12). He has a slave named Carpus (36.5), and is struck by a falling acrobat (54.1).

It is worth noting that these allusions occur mostly at the beginning of the *Cena*; in the first six chapters there is, on average, one in each; and there are two in ch. 36. After that they are more widely scattered. This is just what we would expect if Petronius makes Trimalchio into a character who apes the emperor or has much in common with him. Petronius perhaps felt there was no need to keep the joke up after a few pages. The habits and tastes of other emperors, such as Augustus and Claudius, are then drawn upon.

It remains unclear, whether Trimalchio is deliberately trying to be a "Nero", or whether Petronius just makes him the way he is for humorous reasons: it might be that Trimalchio has taken Nero as his model for gracious living. It was observed earlier that the importance which Trimalchio attaches to his *genius* (53.3, 75.2) might have reference to the imperial cult, and it may also be observed that he claims to have received the office of *sevir* in absence (71.12); this might refer to the emperor's privilege of taking the consulship *in absentia*.

But perhaps it is in the recital of the daily bulletin (*tamquam urbis acta*, 53.3) that the similarities are most striking. From the recital we hear that a slave is supposedly executed for *maiestas* against Trimalchio (53.3); that Trimalchio *cum elogio exheredebatur*; that a slave is exiled to Baiae (53.10), a ludicrous event perhaps, but Nero himself had criminals despatched there. In fact that whole bulletin suggests that Trimalchio wants his vast property to appear as organized as a miniature Rome, and the sharp-witted audience of the *Satyricon* will not have missed the complex joke, or even the frivolous allusions to the treason accusations so frequent under the Julio-Claudians.[1] In effect, Trimalchio deliberately claims for himself attributes and practices usually associated with the *princeps*, although it would probably be going too far to claim that Trimalchio consistently adopted Nero's habits and tastes: apart from anything else, he differs from Nero in his favourite *factio* at the chariot races.[2]

It is a reasonable conclusion, then, that Petronius gave Trimalchio many Neronian characteristics, and that Nero will have found this amusing. It is out of the question that Petronius intends his satiric portrait of Trimalchio to *satirize* Nero. The truth is that Petronius has drawn a comic picture of one who is unutterably vulgar, and part of the humorous portrait is the pathetic attempt of the freedman to appear cultured and a man of taste.[3] Indeed it may be seen as an oblique and typically Petronian compliment to Nero that Trimalchio should try to imitate the very best.

3. OTHER IMPERIAL AND CONTEMPORARY REFERENCES

The Neronian allusions account for only a small part of Trimalchio's little ways. Though he represents a certain social phenomenon, and in this respect is a generalised figure, he is also given very many characteristics which are highly individual, and so not a necessary part of Petronius' social satire. And a large number of these individual traits have parallels with certain persons either proverbial or else living in Petronius' day.

Several of these traits have long been observed. Trimalchio's sermon on *crepitus ventris* is an obvious reference to Claudius; his mock-funeral scene is very like those of Pacuvius and Turannius; several aspects of his career are distinctly reminiscent of Tigellinus'; his posthumously assumed "*agnomen*" Maecenatianus is sufficient hint of his own aspirations, and sure enough he has certain traits in common with Maecenas; his absurd attempts to appear well-read are very similar to those of Calvisius Sabinus; in not a few respects, such as his fondness for rebuses, he is rather like Augustus; like Sextus Pompeius, he owns vast estates, and he has the same *gentilicium*. All these examples have been observed and discussed by previous scholars, and some at least provide clear illustrations of Petronius' technique in the character portrayal of Trimalchio.[1]

---

[1] See K.F.C. Rose, 'Trimalchio's Accountant', *CP* 62 (1967), 258-9.

[2] It so happens that in 64 A.D. occurred a remarkable case of emperor-imitation, by D. Iunius Torquatus (Tac. *Ann.* 15.35).

[3] O. Kiefer, *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome* (1934), 256, quotes Ribbeck with approval, where he refers to "the amusement of the proud Romans at the vain efforts of provincial snobs to imitate them."

What has not been observed, however, is the surprising similarity of Trimalchio to a certain freedman of Vitellius whom Petronius probably knew. This man, Asiaticus, had been a *catamitus* in his youth, and was noted for his *contumacia*; he came from Asia, and at one time had been a seller of wine in Puteoli; he had been sent to the arena, and fortunately saved from it, as Encolpius was. Thus he was a man not unlike Trimalchio, and it is quite probable that Trimalchio's career and character were based primarily on him.[2]

It appears, then, that many aspects of Trimalchio's character and habits are drawn from various contemporaries of Petronius. Often the persons alluded to in this way are charged with vulgarity, though sometimes the intention is merely to make Trimalchio's pretentiousness more vivid and amusing.

Apart from the figure of Trimalchio, Petronius does not allude very often to contemporaries in this way. There are a few possibilities; the pointed reference to Vatinius (*BC* 46) might be an allusion to the appalling "court jester" of the same name whom Nero favoured;[3] there was a Pannychis associated with the Court, though of course the name is not uncommon;[4] we have already noted earlier the possible allusion to Locusta.

Most of Petronius' other characters are much more like pure fiction, and many of them are stock characters, such as the *rhetor* Agamemnon and the grouser Ganymede. Even Eumolpus appears to be a stock type, though, as it happens, there is an uncanny resemblance between him and a notable contemporary, Remmius

---

[1] Claudius, 47.4-6, Suet. *Claud.*32.5; Pacuvius, 52.9, 78.5, Sen. *Ep.* 12.8; Tigellinus, G. Highet, *TAPA* 72 (1941), 190 n. 42; *AJP* 72 (1951) 393; R. H. Crum, *CW* 45 (1952), 167; Maecenas, Heinse 110/137; Goldast and others 126/171; R. B. Steele, *CJ* 15 (1920), 283-4; Calvisius Sabinus, Sen. *Ep.* 27.5ff; Augustus, W. Süss, *de eo* &c., (1926) 79; Pompeius, *PIR*^{1} I P 450, *RE* XXI 2265-7, Sen. *Tranqu. An.* 11.10, P. Grimal, *RPh* 16 (1942) 161ff; compare Demetrius Pompeianus of Gadara, *RE* IV 2802, Sen. *Tranqu. An.* 8.6.

[2] Suet. *Vitell.*12.2 *RE* II 1578 cf. *RE* XXIII 2051. Trimalchio's fondness for the arena may be relevant here. Possibly Patrobius (*RE* XVIII 2253, *NH* 35.168, Dio 63 3.1-2) lived at Puteoli also.

[3] Observe also Seneca's remarks on Vatinius, *Ep.* 94.25, 118.4, 120.19, which are roughly contemporary with the *BC*.

[4] Cf. 25.1, *CIL* VI 15207, *RE* III 2841—the wife of Claudius Phoebus.

Palaemon.[1] Both enjoyed the privileged position of educating youth, and both made shameful abuse of their position. Both have plenty to say about literature, and both possess insufferable vanity. Both are fond of declaiming their poems, and Suetonius says of Remmius, *nec non etiam poemata faciebat ex tempore.* In short, both are vain, homosexual old pedants, preachers, and versifiers. It is possible, then, that Petronius created the character of Eumolpus with Remmius particularly in mind.

Many of the suggestions put forward here are highly conjectural. If we knew more about Petronius' contemporaries, it is probable that what I have suggested concerning Petronius' models and inspirations would have to be revised.[2] But, on the available evidence at least, it is clear that there are many points where it can be said with some confidence that Petronius is drawing on the characteristics of certain contemporaries for his literary purposes. This gives, of course, added bite to his satire, since he can indirectly mock individuals known to his audience, as well as draw amusing scenes based on more general shortcomings of Roman life and society. He does not invariably have contemporaries in mind; the main feature of the *Satyricon* is the amused and ironical depiction of what was vulgar, vicious, abnormal, pretentious, avaricious, and materialistic in the world of his day; and his attitudes are worked into a succession of knockabout adventures and comic situations, set realistically in the humble strata of Mediterranean society: *quodque facit populus candida lingua refert.*

---

[1] Cf. Suet. *de Gramm.* 23, *RE* I.A. 596-7. He is described as homosexual, most unfit to teach boys, *infamis omnibus vitiis.* The text needs correction: after the charge of *fellatio,* we are told *maxime flagrabat libidinibus in mulieres,* followed by a disgusting homosexual charge. One should therefore read *in mulieres <quoque>* or *<etiam> in mares* (Jernstedt). In the anecdote that follows, *aestuantem* (Beck) is by far the best correction of *festinantem.*

[2] It is important to avoid such extreme forms of the thesis, such as Fisch's attempt to identify Trimalchio with Galba; or Cassitto's attempt to show that Trimalchio is Domitian (*sc. calvus Nero,* the Widow of Ephesus being Livia); [or Bagnani's attempt to identify him with a freedman of Petronius himself.]

APPENDIX A

ALLEGED ALLUSIONS TO NERO IN THE SATYRICON

This Appendix contains a list, as complete as possible, of supposed allusions to the emperor Nero which scholars have discerned in the *Satyricon*. Many of these scholars believed that Petronius was, in some sense, satirizing Nero; one of the first of these was Goldast (102/140). The task of detecting allusions has been performed largely by those who believed that the *Satyricon* was the "*codicilli*" which the Arbiter of Elegance sent to Nero; the most notable among them were de Salas, Wagenseil, Cocchia, and Révay. The latter, along with Steele and Crum, specialised in advancing ideas put forward centuries before.

Not all the items in this Appendix were certainly intended by their authors to be claimed as allusions; for instance, the items attributed to Burman and Cuperus should not really be included, except that, in spite of their authors' opinions, they are perhaps worthy of consideration *as* allusions! Other items may or may not have been intended as allusions; but when the wording of the author is laconic or vague I have, for completeness, included the suggestion.

Since there are over ninety items, it has not been possible to discuss them in detail. Their use as evidence was analysed earlier, and my conclusions are set down. Items that are virtually impossible carry an exclamation mark; those not mentioned on pp. 77-78 above are improbable or doubtful.

1.1, *alio genere furiarum*; Suet. *Nero* 34.7 (Brassicanus 2/3).

5.7, *neve plausor in scenam*; Suet. *Nero* 20.6 (de Salas 69/93).

20.1, *celerius confice*; Suet. *Nero* 29.1 seems to be the only parallel for this use of *conficere*, but cf. *TLL* IV 202.48-50 (the parallel noticed by Burman 67/93).

25.7, *officium nuptiale*; Suet. *Nero* 28.3, Sporus (de Salas 98/125); add Tac. *Ann.* 15.37.

27.2, &c., Trimalchio's idleness and effeminacy; Suet., *Nero* 30.7 (de Salas 101/126f).

27.2, 32.1-2, impudent dress; Suet. *Nero* 51.2 (Heinsius 117/159, R. H. Crum, *CW* 45 (1952), 164—from now on referred to as Crum).

28.2 *unguento perfusus*; Plin. *NH* 13. 22, Eutrop. 7.14.1 (de Salas 103/129).

28.3, *propin*; Suet. *Nero* 48.5—an event of 68 A. D. (J. Révay, *RIGI* 7 (1923) 30—from now on referred to as Révay).

28.4, 32.2, 38.5, colors; Suet. *Nero* 30.7 (Révay 30, Crum 163-4, R. B. Steele, *CJ* 15 (1920), 280—from now on referred to as Steele).

28.4, *cursores iv*; Suet. *Nero* 30.8 (Dousa 1.13, de Salas 104/131-2, Maiuri, *Cena* 153).

28.4, *chiramaxio*; Suet. *Nero* 44.1 (Wagenseil 314/347).

28.8, *color* (cf. on 28.4); de Salas 106/133.

29.6, *tres Parcae*; Sen. *Apoc.* 3-4 (Friedländer 216).

29.8, *pyxis aurea*; Suet. *Nero* 12.9, Dio 61.19.1 (Tornaesius, Pithoeus and Weitzius 108/147-8; de Salas 108/135; Heinsius 363/472; Wagenseil 314/347; Steele 280; F. Täger, *Charisma* 2 (1960), 498 n. 132).

29.9, 50.4-5, 59.2-3, fondness for Homer; Suet. *Nero* 47.1 (Reinesius 254/337, Révay 30-1, Crum 163).

29.9, paintings of gladiators; Plin. *NH* 35.52 (Burman 109-10/149).

30.2, *C. Pompeius*; Suet. *Nero* 1.4, the Domitii called either Cnaeus or Lucius (Wagenseil 314/347)!

30.3, *foras cenat*; Suet. *Nero* 27.2-4 (de Salas 110/137).

30.4. *stellarum vii imagines*; Suet. *Nero* 31.3 (de Salas 110/137).

30.11, *Tyria . . . semel lota*; Suet. *Nero* 30.7, 32.4 (Crum 165).

31.3, 68.3, *puer Alexandrinus*; Suet. *Nero* 20.5 (Steele 280).

31.3, *aqua nivata*; *decocta Neronis*, Sen. *NQ* 4.13.10, Plin. *NH* 31.40, Juv. 5.50, Mart. 14.11.6, Suet. *Nero* 48.5 (Goldast 120/162-3, de Salas 111-2/139, Beck 58-9, Steele 280)!

31.5, the incessant music; Suet. *Nero* 20-22 (de Salas 112/140).

31.7, *pantomimi chorum*; Suet. *Nero* 54 (de Salas 113/140).

31.8, *novo more*; this is taken as a Neronian reference by Steele 280—but no evidence is cited!

31.11, rare foods, appropriate to the luxurious tastes of Nero (de Salas 114/141).

32.1-2, 59.3, 78.5, cushions; Suet. *Nero* 6.8 (Bourdelot *omissum*/170, Crum 164).

32.4, *armilla aurea*; Suet. *Nero* 6.8 (de Salas 115-6/143-4, Crum 164, but *cf.* Heinsius 128/174, who cites Suet. *Gaius* 52.2).

33.2, dicing for high stakes; Suet. *Nero* 30.7 (de Salas 116/144, cf. Burman 129/175).

35.6, *Laserpiciario*; Plin. *NH* 19.38-9, *silphium* (de Salas 121/149-50)!

35.7, love of puns; Suet. *Nero* 33.2 (Crum 199).

36.3, *super pisces*, cf. 39.2; *SHA* Helio. 23.8 (de Salas 122/150)!

36.5, *Carpus*; *CIL* 6.8470 (P. Grimal, *RPh* 15 (1941), 19f, Crum 162, Schnur 29-30).

36.6, *hydraule cantante*; Suet. *Nero* 41.4, 54.1 (Marmorale, *PT* 90-1, *QP* 83, Crum 164; cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 84.10).

37.2ff. the description of Fortunata tallies with what we know of Acte (de Salas 123-4/152-3).

38.8-11, *Incubo*; Suet. *Nero* 39.5, 31.7 (cf. below, on 66.7).

39.4, 74.13, *homo inter homines*; Suet. *Nero* 31.4 (Scheffer 171/232; against, Burman, *ibid.*; Steele 280; cf. Révay 30, who cites also *Sat.* 77.4).

45.11, *equites*; Suet. *Nero* 12.3 (Scheffer 223/300, but cf. Heinsius *ibid.*).

52.1, expensive silver; Plin. *NH* 37.20 (Scheffer 253/336, Maiuri, *Cena* 185).

52.2, *Daedalus*; Suet. *Nero* 12.5, Icarus (Crum 165).

52.2, *Niobe*; Suet. *Nero* 21.2 (Crum 164-5).

52.9, *perite* μὰ Δία; Tac. *Ann.* 14.20 (Heinsius 256/340, cf. Scheffer, *ibid.*).

53.10, *Bais relegatus*; Suet. *Nero* 31.5-6 (Steele 280; Heinsius and Burman 260/344 are puzzled).

54.1, *delapsus puer*; Suet. *Nero* 12.5 (Révay 30, Crum 162-3, but cf. Horace, *Sat.* 2.8. 54-6).

54.1, *alienum mortuum*; Suet. *Nero* 12.6, Nero as a stranger at the arena (Crum 162, but cf. Sen. *Ep.* 12.3).

56.3, forgery of coins; Mart. 12.57.8 (Friedländer 289, but cf. Plin *NH* 33.132).

60.1-3, *circulus ingens*; Suet. *Nero* 31.3 (Heinsius and Scheffer 301/398, Crum 162-3; cf. also Sen. *Ep.* 90.15, G. Bagnani, *AJP* 75 (1954) 32 n. 54).

60.2, *consternatus*; Suet. *Nero* 34.2-3, Tac. *Ann.* 14.8, Agrippina and the collapsing roof (Crum 163)!

66.7, *pax Palamedes*; Crum 197-201 took this as a reference to Nero, since Palamedes was a son of Nauplius, and Nero once recited a "Nauplius" (Suet. *Nero* 39.5). R. S. Rogers (*CW* 39 (1945-6), 53-4) dates this recital to 65 A.D., since Palamedes is associated with a hunt for buried treasure in Dictys Cretensis, *BT* 2.15, and Nero was occupied by a treasure-hunt in 65 A.D. Crum improves on this by calling attention to the finder of treasure in *Sat.* 38.8-11; his name was Diogenes, and Crum takes this as a sly allusion to the Cynic philosopher Isidorus, who criticised Nero at the time of the treasure-hunt. But Isidorus accused Nero *quod Naupli mala bene cantitaret, sua bona male disponeret.* There is nothing about treasure. Further, Palamedes is not *usually* associated with buried treasure. He is known as a wily man, the inventor of letters, a man who unmasked Odysseus only to be eventually outwitted by him (cf. Servius on *Aen.* 2.81, and Hyginus' account).

67.6, *obrussa*; Suet. *Nero* 44.3.

68.1-2, colored dust; Plin. *NH* 33.90, Suet. *Gaius* 18.5, *Nero* 25.3 (H. H. Davis, *CJ* 52 (1957), 362).

71.2, 78.6, Trimalchio's epitaph and fear of death; Suet. *Nero* 46-8 (Révay 31)!

71.11, *puerum plorantem*; Suet. *Nero* 49.3, Sporus in 68 A.D. (Révay 31).

71.12, neglect of philosophy; Suet. *Nero* 52.1, Tac. *Ann.* 14.16 (Crum 165, cf. Bagnani, *AE* 5—sceptical).

72.3, hot baths; Suet. *Nero* 27.2 (Wagenseil 314/347).

73.6, late-night feasting; Suet. *Nero* 27.2 (Süss, *De eo* &c., 79).

74.1-3, cockcrow; Suet. *Nero* 45.4, in 68 A.D. (Crum 199)!

74.13, *ambubaia*; Suet. *Nero* 27.2 (Perrochat, *ad loc.*).

76.10, *mathematicus*; Suet. *Nero* 56, 36.2, Tac. *Ann.* 16.14, *Hist.* 1.22 (Heinsius 382/494, Crum 199).

77.1 viper in the bosom; Suet. *Nero* 6.8 (Scheffer 383-4/496, but cf. Reinesius, *ibid.*).

79.1 *noctis iam mediae*; Suet. *Nero* 27.2 (de Salas 126/155, cf. Süss 73.6).

80.3, *Thebanum par*; Suet. *Nero* 21.5, Nero's tragic rôles (Crum 165).

81.2, *non potuit haurire*; Suet. *Nero* 38.2, probably after 66 A.D. (Steele 280)!

82.2, *nocturnus grassator*; Suet. *Nero* 26.2, *Ann.* 13.25, Dio 61.8.1 (Crum 163).

82.2, devoting the sword; Tac. *Ann.* 15.74 (Cuperus 405/525).

82.5; de Salas 132/162 says that only the leaden-hearted will fail to see a Neronian allusion in these verses! Cf. Burman 407/528.

83.8, *coronae*; Suet. *Nero* 12.7 (de Salas 135/165). van Wouweren 413/535 also cites Suet. *Domit.* 4.8; hostile, N. Ignarra, *De palaestra neapolitana* (1770) 205f; cf. Studer 210-11, *TLL* 4. 982-4.

83.8, *ad imperitos*; Suet. *Nero* 12.7-8 (de Salas 135/166; against, Burman 413/535).

86.4, *asturco*; Suet., *Nero* 46.2 (van Wouweren 419/544, but cf. Burman 420/545).

88.8, 38.8, 117.1-10, greed for money; Suet. *Nero* 31.7, Tac. *Ann.* 16.1-3 (Révay 31.n.1.).

88.9, gold for the Capitol; Suet. *Nero* 12.9 (Pithoeus 427/554, but cf. Burman, *ibid.*).

89.1, *Troiae halosis*; Suet. *Nero* 38.6 (Dousa 1.23, Puteanus and Barthius 428/555, de Salas 142/172).

90.4, *a te exire*; Σ Juv. 8.221, mania for poetry (de Salas 146/177).

99.1, the Epicurean sentiment is appropriate to Nero (de Salas 158/189, but cf. Pithoeus, Barthius, Goldast and Burman 466/604-5)!

109.1, *tabulas foederis signat*; Suet. *Nero* 17 (de Salas 172/205)!

109.9, a poem on beautiful hair; Plin. *NH* 37.50, *sucinae.*

110.2, hair style; Suet. *Nero* 51.2 (Burman 505/655).

111-3, the Matron of Ephesus; it used to be thought that this story was depicted on Nero's Golden House; cf. Iannelli 126, L. Herrmann, *Latom.* 10 (1951), 65f; R. Colin, *RFC* 31 (1953), 99f.

119-24, the *BC*; cf. the remarks of Dousa 2.12.

BC 16, ships carrying cargo for the arena; Suet. *Nero* 45.1 (Goldast 555/718).

BC 17, the Golden House, Suet. *Nero* 31.1 (de Salas 196-7/233, Révay 30; G. H. Kraffert, *Neue Beiträge* &c., (1888) 18, cites also Suet. *Nero* 45.1).

BC 20-6, castration of boys; Suet. *Nero* 28.3, Sporus (J. G. Mössler's commentary (1842) 60).

BC 29, *imitatur vilius aurum*; Plin. *NH* 35.3 (de Salas 198/234)

BC 87ff, extravagance; Suet. *Nero* 31.1, Tac. *Ann.* 15.42 (de Salas 201/238; Grenade, *REA* 50 (1948) 272ff; against, Sambucus and Burman 569/736).

135.8.6. cf. the previous item (de Salas 238/279, Grenade, *op. cit.*).

136.4ff, the geese episode; Crum 168 n. 84 suggests that Nero may have encountered some *gaucherie* in connexion with Juno's sacred geese!

140.7, Corax as a "quadruped"; Suet. *Nero* 29.1 (de Salas 246/288)!

141.2ff, cannibalism; Suet. *Nero* 37.4, an Egyptian *polyphagus.*

Frag. 28, Midas; cf. Σ Pers. 1.121, *carmen Einsied.* 1.1 (Goldast 680/876-7).

APPENDIX B

PETRONIUS' ADAPTATIONS OF LUCAN

The subject matter of the *BC* is derived from the first Book of the *Pharsalia* only; Petronius does not mention events which Lucan covers in any later Book. It is remarkable that Petronius in under 300 lines manages to deal with almost all the subject-matter of Lucan's first Book. Of course there is considerable adaptation and often extreme brevity. The details are as follows:

45-66 (the earth quaking), *BC* 264-6;
67-97 (a cosmic collapse), *BC* 79-86;
98-157 (the Triumvirate), *BC* 61-6;
158-82 (the degeneration of Rome), *BC* 1-60;
183 (Caesar's crossing of the Alps), *BC* 177-208;
195-203 (Caesar's speech at the Rubicon
299-351 (Caesar's speech to the soldiers } *BC* 156-76;
330-2 (the Sullan War), *BC* 96-9;
466-522 (Panic in Rome and Italy), *BC* 209-44;
522-83 (Prodigies), *BC* 126-40;
679-94 (prophecy of War), *BC* 111-5.

The most striking point is that Petronius *expands* on Caesar's crossing of the Alps, which he substitutes for Lucan's episode at the Rubicon. But Mössler's contention, that Petronius is brief where Lucan is verbose and *vice versa*, is not warranted by the above analysis. Of necessity Petronius is usual more brief than Lucan, and where he is not, it can be explained by Petronius' free adaptation. The fact that Petronius has more to say about the moral decline of Rome must be viewed in the context of 118, where realistic historical analysis is deplored. It must also be remembered that a stale moralistic exposition is humorously put in the mouth of the degenerate Eumolpus (88.2ff); and it is no accident, for instance, that Petronius' "moral analysis" includes strictures upon the prevalence of homosexuality.

Petronius omits the following features of Lucan's first Book; lines 1-44 (the introduction), 185-94 (the spirit of Rome), the speech of Laelius (352-91) and the arousing of the Gallic tribes (392-465), the divinations of Arruns and Figulus (584-679). Petronius cleverly incorporates the episode at the Rubicon, and Caesar's speech there, into the Alps episode (*BC* 156-76).

Since Petronius, true to the precepts of 118, includes long passages describing the supernatural forces behind the war, he would obviously leave out the passages describing the divinations. These hellish Powers are described in *BC* 67-78, 90-5, 100-110, 116-25, 245-63, 264-94. It is therefore remarkable that Petronius should deal with so much of Lucan's subject-matter in so few lines, and yet manage to incorporate several passages in which un-Olympian deities are substituted for Lucan's historical *religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*.

Scores of parallels between Lucan and Petronius' *BC* have been detected, especially by Mössler, Collignon, Baldwin, and Stubbe. It is curious that they all failed to stress the most interesting one: namely, the similarity of Petronius' ending to Lucan's ending; although Burman and Stubbe do in fact give the reference because of the incidence of the word *Epidamnus*. But most of the scores of "parallels" are parallels only in a loose sense; where, for instance, the two writers both use some poetic phrase or "tag", or where they both refer to some historical event without any great similarity of language. Here I will quote only those passages from Lucan where there seems to be a *probable* imitation or echo in Petronius' poem:

With *BC* 1, 6-7, 26-7, 85-7 compare *Phars.* 1.160-7:

namque ut opes nimias mundo fortuna subacto
intulit et rebus mores cessere secundis
praedaque et hostiles luxum suasere rapinae,
non auro tectisve modus, mensasque priores
aspernata fames; cultus gestare decoros
vix nuribus rapuere mares; fecunda virorum
paupertas fugitur totoque accersitur orbe
quo gens quaeque perit;

with *BC* 6-7, *Phars.* 2.351:

sint aliena toris iam fato in bella vocante;

with *BC* 1-2, *Phars.* 1.110:

quae mare, quae terras, quae totum possidet orbem;

with *BC* 14-16, *Phars.* 1.41-3:

his, Caesar, Perusina fames Mutinaeque labores

accedant fatis et quas premit aspera classes
Leucas et ardenti servilia bella sub Aetna . . . ;

with *BC* 36, *Phars.* 2.585, 715:

hinc me victorem gelidas ad Phasidos undas . . .;
ut, Pagasaea ratis peteret cum Phasidos undas;

with *BC* 39-52, *Phars.* 1.178-82:

hinc rapti fasces pretio sectorque favoris
ipse sui populus letalisque ambitus urbi
annua venali referens certamina Campo;
hinc usura vorax avidumque in tempora faenus
et concussa fides et multis utile bellum;

with *BC* 49-50, *Phars.* 2.655-6, 227-8:

ipsa, caput mundi, bellorum maxima merces,
Roma capi facilis. . .;
exulibus Mariis bellorum maxima merces
Roma recepta fuit . . .;

with *BC* 54-5, *Phars.* 9.741-2 (Petronius describes greed for money; Lucan, snake-bites!):

ecce, subit virus tacitum, carpitque medullas
ignis edax calidaque incendit viscera tabe;

with *BC* 61-6, *Phars.* 6.817-8:

Europam, miseri, Libyamque Asiamque timete:
distribuit tumulos vestris fortuna triumphis;

with *BC* 82-7, *Phars.* 1.70-4:

invida fatorum series summisque negatum
stare diu nimioque graves sub pondere lapsus
nec se Roma ferens. sic cum compage soluta
saecula tot mundi suprema cogerit hora
antiquum repetens iterum chaos . . .;

with *BC* 96-9, *Phars.* 1.330-2:

sic et Sullanum solito tibi lambere ferrum
durat, Magne, sitis. nullus semel ore receptus
pollutas patitur sanguis mansuescere fauces;

with *BC* 111, *Phars.* 1.679-80, 694:

video Pangaea nivosis
cana iugis latosque Haemi sub rupe Philippos . . .
. . . vidi iam, Phoebe, Philippos;

with *BC* 112-3, *Phars.* 1.569-70:

> tum fragor armorum magnaeque per avia voces
> auditae . . .

with *BC* 116-21 (cf. 277), *Phars.* 3.14-19:

> vidi ipsa tenentis
> Eumenidas quaterent quas vestris lampadas armis;
> praeparat innumeras puppes Acherontis adusti
> portitor; in multas laxantur Tartara poenas;
> vix operi cunctae dextra properante sorores
> sufficiunt, lassant rumpentis stamina parcas;

with *BC* 126-7, *Phars.* 2.1-4:

> iamque irae patuere deum manifestaque belli
> signa dedit mundus legesque et foedera rerum
> praescia monstrifero vertit natura tumultu
> indixitque nefas;

with *BC* 128, *Phars.* 1.540-1:

> ipse caput medio Titan cum ferret Olympo
> condidit ardentis atra caligine currus . . .;

with *BC* 141-2, *Phars.* 1.204-5:

> inde moras solvit belli tumidumque per amnem
> signa tulit propera;

with *BC* 152-4, *Phars.* 3.88:

> excelsa de rupe procul iam conspicit urbem

with *BC* 160 (cf. 294), *Phars.* 7.473:

> primaque Thessaliam Romano sanguine tinxit;

with *BC* 174-5, *Phars.* 1.226-7:

> te, Fortuna, sequor. procul hinc iam foedera sunto;
> credidimus satis his, utendum est iudice bello;

with *BC* 216, *Phars.* 7.180 (not very significant):

> ante oculos volitare suos;

with *BC* 226-32, *Phars.* 1.504-9 (Getty 98 notes the difference between the two passages, cf. Lejay 69):

> nullum iam languidus aevo
> evaluit revocare parens coniunxve maritum
> fletibus, aut patrii, dubiae dum vota salutis

conciperent, tenuere lares; nec limine quisquam
haesit et extremo tunc forsitan urbis amatae
plenus abit visu;

with *BC* 233-6, *Phars.* 1. 498-504:

qualis, cum turbidus Auster
reppulit a Libycis inmensum Syrtibus aequor
fractaque veliferi sonuerunt pondera mali,
desilit in fluctus deserta puppe magister,
navitaque et nondum sparsa compage carina
naufragium sibi quisque facit, sic urbe relicta
in bellum fugitur;

with *BC* 262-3, *Phars.* 1.572-3:

ingens urbem cingebat Erinys,
excutiens pronam flagranti vertice pinum;

with *BC* 265, *Phars.* 1.45-7 (cf. Sat. 136.6,5 and *Phars.* 1.56-9):

te, cum statione peracta
astra petes serus, praeclari regia caeli
excipiet gaudente polo;

with *BC* 277, *Phars.* 7.568, 3.14-5 (cf. *BC* 284):

sanguineum veluti quatiens Bellona flagellum . . .
vidi ipsa tenentis
Eumenidas quaterent quas vestris lampadas armis;

(but cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.703, Sen. *Dial.* 4.35.6, and J. D. P. Bolton, *CQ n.s.* 6 (1956), 238.)
with *BC* 290-4, *Phars.* 10.545-6:

ad campos, Epidamne, tuos, ubi solus apertis
obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum;

with *BC* 294, *Phars.* 7.473 (cf. Cornelissen's emendation *Romano* in the Petronius text):

primaque Thessaliam Romano sanguine tinxit.

So much for the more significant parallel passages. Many even of these do not help to prove that Petronius was imitating Lucan; *BC* 277, for instance, could easily be derived independently from Vergil.

Next, I give the references to other parallels which have been discerned. Examination of these helps to show how similar the style and language of the *BC* is to that of the *Pharsalia*, although Petronius' dependence on Lucan will have been sufficiently indicated by the examples quoted above:

BC 1-2, 7.422-5; *BC* 6-7, 6.783.10.149-50; *BC* 14-16, 9.706-7, 620; *BC* 2, 1.15; *BC* 7, 10.156-8; *BC* 14, 9.586; *BC* 21-2, 26-7, 8.367-8, 10.131-4; *BC* 27-9, 10.144-6; *BC* 27-31, 9. 426-30; *BC* 31-3, 37, 4.373-6, 10.155-8; *BC* 39, cf. *BC* 165, 1.314; *BC* 39-41, 4.816-20; *BC* 46, 1.128, 9.299; *BC* 56, 1.12; *BC* 57, 1.182; *BC* 58, 1.171; *BC* 58-60, 2. 312-3; *BC* 62, 1.687, 1.104; *BC* 61, 1.99-100; *BC* 63, 1.685-6; *BC* 64, 1.691; *BC* 64-5, 10.338-41; *BC* 74-5, 3. 442; *BC* 79-80, 2.143-4; *BC* 79-81, 2.12-3; *BC* 80-5, 1.510-1, 1.81-4; *BC* 84, 1.3; *BC* 86, 1.68-9, *BC* 93, 6.742-4; *BC* 92, 6.712-4; *BC* 96, 1.38-9, 6.718; *BC* 98-9, 1.117, 2.139-41, 7.865, 7.317, 7.851-2; *BC* 104, 1.631-2; *BC* 111-5, 1.679-94; *BC* 112-3, 7.591-2; *BC* 114, 10.328; *BC* 116, 6.799-800; *BC* 119, 6.704-5; *BC* 126-7, 1.522-5, 7.151-2; *BC* 130-1, 1.538-9; *BC* 132-3, 1.552-5, 1.569; *BC* 134-5, 1.578-80; *BC* 135-6, 1.545-7; *BC* 137-8, 1.568, 1.570, 7.179-80; *BC* 138, 6.623; *BC* 139, 1.526-9; *BC* 148, 7.136; *BC* 152-4, 1.183, 1.392; *BC* 156, 1.195, 225-7; *BC* 158, 7.91-2; *BC* 160, 1.202 (cf. *BC* 163-4, 1.202-3); *BC* 161-2, 1.306-11; *BC* 162, 7.256; *BC* 164-5, 1.288-90; *BC* 165-6 (cf. 41), 10.407-9; *BC* 168, 10.393, 2.439; *BC* 165-6, 1.314-5 (cited by Farnaby); *BC* 168-9, 1.200, 2.498-9, 7.261-2; *BC* 170-2, 7.252-3, 7.303, 1.340-5; *BC* 170-3, 7.264-9, 287-8 (Baldwin also cites 7.257-8, which Housman deleted), 7.304-10; *BC* 174-5, 6.6-8, 603; *BC* 187-9, 4.50-1, 83-5; *BC* 191, 6.471-3, 347-9; *BC* 203, 3.108-9; *BC* 207, 7.144-6; *BC* 208, 1.36; *BC* 210ff, 1.469-72; *BC* 210-3, 1.474-8; *BC* 214, 7.699-700; *BC* 216-8, 223-7, 1.490-8; *BC* 216-8, 221, 2.447-8, 1.490-1, 1.486; *BC* 213-4, 2.535-6; *BC* 219-20, 1.227; *BC* 224-5, 1.519-20; *BC* 226-8, 1.511-4, 2.30-2; *BC* 225, 5.30-1; *BC* 233-7, 7.125-7, 1.519-20; *BC* 238-9, 243, 245-8, 1.521-5, 2.708-9; *BC* 241, 4.142-3; *BC* 246, 9.655, 1.522-4; *BC* 241-2, 2.580-2; *BC* 264-5, 5.560-7; *BC* 265-6, 2.35; *BC* 271, 1.578; *BC* 279-81, 2. 396-8, 7.649-51; *BC* 282, 9.255; *BC* 288-9, 1.269-71, 4.799-801, 4.819-20; *BC* 291, 2.439-46, 656.

One might add here some additional material collected by Baldwin and Stubbe which is purely linguistic in character, but which will virtually complete the collection of matter common to Lucan's *Pharsalia* and Petronius:

BC 6, 6.783; *BC* 11, 10.125, 156 (to justify the emendation *coccum dant*), 10.142; *BC* 14, 1.77; *BC* 16, 9. 619-20; *BC* 19, 7.329, 8.692; *BC* 29, 1.163-4; *BC* 49-50, 2.227; *BC* 54-5, 2.239; *BC* 79-80, 2.143-4; *BC* 89, 4.126; *BC* 98, 1.580ff; *BC* 111-2, 7.787-846; *BC* 114, 5.712, 10.313; *BC* 141-2, 1.204; *BC* 144-5, 1.689; *BC* 148, 7.136; *BC* 158, 4.484, 7.252; *BC* 165, 1.314; *BC* 166, 5.263; *BC* 172, 2.584; *BC* 180, 1.569-70, 5.405; *BC* 181, 5.396; *BC* 206, 9.644; *BC* 241, 1.577, 4.142; *BC* 241-2, 3.76-7; *BC* 245, 1.644-5; *BC* 246, 9.655; *BC* 253, 4.190; *BC* 256, 1.528-9, 7.568; *BC* 264, 1.529; *BC* 267, 1.121; *BC* 266, 2.35; *BC* 274, 6.224-5; *BC* 276, 2.38; *BC* 286, 4.701.

Finally, one should add Petronius' possible echoes of Lucan apart from those in the *BC*:

Sat. 19.6, *Phars.* 3.735 (fortuitous).

nox subit atque oculos vastae obduxere tenebrae, . . .

Sat. 93.2.5-6, *Phars.* 9.440-1;

Quem mundi barbara damnis
Syrtis alit.

The phrase *moenia Martis* in *Sat.* 55.6 line 1 and *Phars.* 3.453 is traditional in Roman poetry (Ennius, Lucretius).

The verses of *Sat.* 108.14 have some echoes of Lucan, *Quis furor* (1.8), *mors una* (3.689), and blood adding to the sea's waters (2.214-20). (Some other parallels urged by Ussani are not worthy of mention.) Finally, compare *Sat.* 135.8.1-3 with *Phars.* 10.112-5, 119-21.

. . . laqueataque tecta ferebant
divitias crassumque trabes absconderat aurum.
nec summis crustata domus sectisque nitebat
marmoribus, . . .
. . .ebur atria vestit,
et suffecta manu foribus testudinis Indae
terga sedent, . . .

and *Sat.* 141.9 with *Phars.* 3.349-50:

nec pavet hic populus pro libertate subire
obsessum Poeno gessit quae Marte Saguntum.

My own arguments rest on the Lucan passages which are actually quoted in this appendix; however much doubt may be cast on several of the supposed parallels, it remains clear that Petronius had read Lucan's first three books and expected his audience to have done the same. It also seems that Petronius knew Lucan's final passage, and we may conclude that Books 1-3 of the *Pharsalia* had been published when Petronius wrote the *BC*, and that he had some knowledge of Book 10.

These conclusions are confirmed from Petronius' echoes of Lucan in the rest of the *Satyricon*. The first likely echo comes in *Sat.* 108.14, where *Quis furor* looks like a reference to Lucan's apostrophe early in the *Pharsalia*—from a line, indeed, which some have thought to have been originally the first line of the whole work. Another echo of Book 10 is perhaps to be discerned in *Sat.* 135, and from Book 3 in *Sat.* 141. However, it is not possible to prove that Petronius had not, or had, read all the books of the *Pharsalia*. Very possibly he had; but if so, because of his greater familiarity with the published books, he used them far more than the others for his humorous imitation of Lucan, while not avoiding faint echoes of other passages (some remembered perhaps subconsciously), and not above using a neat variation of the last lines of the tenth Book to end his own poem.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Several articles of insufficient merit or significance have been omitted, and book-reviews have not been listed unless they are of special importance. General handbooks which merely reproduce the opinions of others are similarly omitted.

EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Burman, P., *variorum* editions, 1709, 1743.

Bücheler, F., *ed. maior* 1862. *Supp.* W. Heräus, 1922 and P. Bachmann, 1958.

Brugnoli, G., *Petronius* (1961).

Friedländer, L., *Cena Trimalchionis*^{2} (1906).

Baldwin, F. T., *The Bellum Civile of Petronius* (1911).

Sage, E.T., *The Satiricon of Petronius* (1929).

Paratore, E., *Il Satyricon di Petronio*, 2 vols. (1933).

Stubbe, H., *Die Verseinlagen in Petron, Phil. Supp.* xxv (1933).

Heräus, W., *Cena Trimalchionis*^{3} (1939).

Maiuri, A., *La Cena di Trimalchione* (1945).

Cesareo, G. A., & Terzaghi, N., *Il romanzo satirico di Petronio Arbitro*^{3} (1950).

Sedgwick, W. B., *Cena Trimalchionis*^{2} (1950).

Schmeck, H., *Cena Trimalchionis* (1954).

Ernout, A., *Pétrone, le Satiricon*^{4} (1958).

Paratore, E., *La narrative latina nell'età di Nerone* II (1961).

Marmorale, E. V., *Cena Trimalchionis*^{2} (1961).

Müller, K., *Petronii Satyricon* (1961).

Perrochat, P., *Cena Trimalchionis*^{3} (1962).

Marzullo, A., and Bonaria, M., *Petronio Arbitro, il Satiricon* (1962).

Müller, K., *Petronius Satyrica* (1965).

Schnur, H. C., *Petron, Satyricon: Ein römische Schelmenroman* (1968).

Sullivan, J. P., *Petronius, The Satyricon and the Fragments*^{2} (1969),

Castorina, E., *Petronio Arbitro: Dal Satyricon* (1970).

II. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albertini, E., 'La composition dans les oeuvres philosophiques de Sénèque', *BEFAR* 127 (1923).

Alfonsi, L., 'Petronio e i Teodori', *RFIC* 26 (1948), 46ff.

Amatucci, A. G., *La letteratura di Roma imperiale* (1947), 315f.

de Azevedo, F., *No tempo de Petronio* (1930).

Bagnani, G., *Arbiter of Elegance* (1954).

Baldwin, F. T., *The Bellum Civile of Petronius* (1911).

Bardon, H., *Les empereurs et les lettres latines* (1940).

Bartsch, J., *Z. Kritik der Briefe von Seneca* (1876).

Beck, C., *The Age of Petronius Arbiter* (1856).

Beloch, J. K., *Campanien*^{2} (1890) 450f.

Bendz, G., 'Sprachliche Bemerkungen z. Petron', *Eran.* 39 (1941), 27ff.

Bickel, E., 'Petronius' *simplicitas* bei Tacitus', *RhM* 90 (1941), 269ff.

Binder, O. W., *Die Abfassungszeit v. Senecas Briefen* (1905).

Biscardi, A., 'Petronio 70.10-11', *SIFC* 15 (1938), 71ff.

——, 'Postilla petroniana', *RIFC* 17 (1939), 342ff.

——, *Manumissio per mensam e affrancazione pretorie* (1939).

Bogner, H., 'Petronius bei Tacitus', *H* 76 (1941), 223f.

Boissier, G., *L'Opposition sous les Césars* (1875), chs. 5 and 6.

Bondonio, V., 'De nonnullis T. Petronii Arbitri fontibus', C &N 1 (1905), 52ff, 104ff, 195ff, 243ff; 2 (1906), 16ff.

Borszák, I., 'Die *simplicitas* u. der römische Puritanismus', *EPhK* 70 (1947), 1ff.

Bourdelot, J., See Burman's editions.

Bourgery, A., 'Les lettres à Lucilius sont-ils de vraies lettres?', *PRh* 35 (1911), 40ff.

Browning, R., 'The Date of Petronius', *CR* 63 (1949), 12ff.

——, in *CR n.s.* 4 (1954), 33; 6 (1956), 45ff.

Bruère, R. T., 'The Scope of Lucan's Historical Epic', *CP* 45 (1950), 217ff.

Brugnoli, G., '*L'intitulatio* del *Satyricon*', *RCCM* 3 (1961), 317ff.

Bücheler, F., 'Sittenzüge d. röm. Kaiserzeit', *Neue Schweiz. Mus.* 3 (1863), 14ff. (*Kl. Schr.* 1.(1915), 423ff.)

Buchheit, V., 'Statius Geburtstagsgedicht z. Ehren Lucans', *H* 88 (1960), 231ff.

——, 'Lucans *Pharsalia* u. der Frage der Unvollendung', *RhM* 104 (1961), 362ff.

Burck, E., 'Das Menschenbild in röm. Epos', *Gymn.* 65 (1958), 121ff.

Cabaniss, A., 'A Footnote to the Petronian Question', *CP* 49 (1954), 98ff.

Cahen, R., *Le Satiricon et ses origines* (1925).

Campanile, E., 'Osservazione sulla lingua di Petronio', *ASNP* 26 (1957), 54ff.

di Capua, F., 'Il ritmo prosaico in Petronio', *GIF* 1 (1948), 37ff.(= *Scritti minori* (1959)^1, 353ff).

Cassitto, I., *Phaedri fabulae ineditae* 32 (1811).

Castorina, E., 'Petronio e i *poetae novelli*', *GIF* 1 (1948), 213ff.

——, 'Ancora su Petronio e i poetae novelli', *GIF* 2 (1949), 175ff.

Cesareo, G. A., *Il romanzo satirico di Petronio Arbitro*^{3} (1950), viii-ix.

Chabert, S., 'Le tremblement de terre a Pompeii', *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), 115ff.

Christensen, H., 'Alexander der Gross in d. röm. Dichtungen', *NJKA* 23 (1909), 127f.

Ciaffi, V., *La Struttura del Satyricon* (1955).

Cizek, E., 'Despre redactarea scrisorilor lui Seneca', *Stud. Clas.* 2 (1960), 257 ff.

——, 'Autour de la date du Satyricon de Pétrone', *Stud. Clas.* 7 (1965), 197ff.

Cocchia, E., 'La satira e la parodia nel *Satiricon* di Petronio Arbitro', *RFC* 25 (897), 353ff.

——, 'Napoli e il *Satyricon* di Petronio Arbitro', *ASPN* 18 (1893), 278ff.

Collignon, A., '*Étude sur Pétrone. La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon* (1892).

——, in *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), 121ff.

Crum, R. H., 'Petronius and the Emperors', *CW* 45 (1952), 161ff.

Delatte, L., 'Lucilius, l'ami de Sénèque', *LEC* 4 (1935), 367ff., 546ff.

Debray, L., 'Pétrone et le droit privé romain', *NRD* 43 (1919), 5ff., 127ff.

Devoto, G., *Storia della lingua di Roma* (1940), 255ff.

Diels, H., 'Seneca u. Lucan', *Berlin Abhandl.* (1885), 3.1.

Diepenbrock, A. J. M., *L. Annaei Senecae . . . vita* (1888), 160ff.

Dissertationis isagogicae ad Herculanensium voluminum explanationem pars prima, incerti auctoris (1797).

Dobroiu, E., 'Quelques problèmes de la documentation de Pétrone' *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti: Serie Stiinte Sociale Filologie* 13 (1964), 145-177.

Dousa, J. (van der Does), *Praecidanea*, see Burman's editions.

Dubois, C., 'Pouzzoles antiques', *Bibl. de l'Ecole fr. d'Ath. et Rome* 98 (1907).

Duff, J. W., *Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*^{2} (1960), 179ff.

Eckermann, K., *Petronius*, in Ersch-Gruber's *Encyclopaedia*, XIX (1844), 323ff., 472ff.

Eichburger, K. A., *Untersuch. z. Lucan* (1935).

Enia, M., *Il Satiricon e il suo autore Petronio Arbitro* (1899).

Dell' Era, A., 'L'uso delle congiunzioni copulative in Petronio', *RCCM* 8 (1966), 58-61

Ernle, Lord, "Latin Prose Fiction", *Edinburgh Review* 231 (1920), 26ff.

Faider, P., *Études sur Sénèque* (1921).

Ficari, Q., *La figura di Trimalchione* (1910).

Fisch, R., *Terracina-Anxur: Kaiser u. Galba* (1898).

Francken, C. M., 'Parerga' *Mn.* 22 (1894), 162ff.

Fränkel, E., 'Lucan als Mittler der antiken Pathos', *Warburg. Vortr.* 4 (1924), 229ff. (= *Kl. Schr.* (1964), 2.233ff.)

Friedländer, L., in *Ind. Lect. in Acad. Albert* 4 (1860), 3f.

Funaioli, G., 'Ancora sull'età di Petronio' *RABol* 10 (1937), 46ff.

——, 'E ancora sull'età del *Satiricon*', *SIFC* 15 (1938), 197ff.

——, 'Nota marginale a Petronio', *SIFC* 16 (1939), 249ff.

Gallavotti, C., *Introduzione al Satiricon* (1948), 1907-8.

Gaselee, S., *Materials for an Edition of Petronius* (unpublished).

——, *A Collotype Reproduction of . . . the Codex Traguriensis* (1915).

Genthe, H., *De Lucani vita et scriptis* (1859).

Gercke, A., 'Senecastudien', *FleckeisenJ Supp.* 22 (1895), 321ff.

Goldast, M., See Burman's editions.

Gotschlich, J., 'De parodiis Senecae apud Petronium', *Festschrift zu F. Haases . . . Doktorjubilaüm* (Breslau, 1863), pp. 26-29.

Greaves, I., 'Essays in the History of Roman Land-tenure, &c.', *Journal of the Ministry of Public Education* 361 (1905). 42ff. (in Russian).

Grenade, P., 'Un exploit de Néron', *REA* 1 (1948), 272ff.

Gresseth, G. K., 'The Quarrel between Lucan and Nero: *CP* 52 (1957), 24ff.

Grimal, P., 'Note à Pétrone, *Satiricon* xxvi: (*sic*), *RPh* 15 (1941), 19f.

——, 'Sur quelques noms propres de la *Cena Trimalchionis*' *RPH* 16 (1942), 161ff.

——, 'L'éloge de Néron au début de la Pharsalia', *REL* 38 (1960), 296ff.

Griset, E., 'Lucanea', *RSC* 2 (1954), 109ff., 185ff.; 3 (1955), 56ff., 134ff., 203ff.; 4 (1956) 26ff.

de Guerle, J-N-M., *Récherches sceptiques sur Pétrone* (1797).

Gummère, R., 'The Modern Note in Seneca's Letters', *CP* 10 (1915), 142ff.

Gutu, G., 'Scrisorile lui Seneca sunt adevarate scrisori ?', *AISC* 4 (1941-3), 35ff.

Haase, F., Edition of Seneca, (Teubner 1852) Vol. III, p. v; 1878, *v.* III, *pp* iii-iv.

Haberlin, C., in *BPhW* 1893, col. 947.

Haffter, H., 'Dem schwanken zunglein lauschend wachte Cäsar dort', *MH* 14 (1957), 118ff.

Haley, H. W., 'Quaestiones petronianae', *HSCP* 2 (1891), 1ff.

Heinse, N., See Burman's editions.

Heitland, W.E., Introduction to G.E. Haskins' edition of Lucan (1887).

Helm, R., in *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 229ff.

Henrion, R., 'Le Satyricon et manumissio per mensam', *RBPh* 22 (1943) 198ff.

HERMANN, L., 'Chronologie des ouvrages en prose de Sénèque', *Latom.* 1 (1937), 94ff.

——, 'Deux allusions contemporaine dans le livre iii . . . de Lucain', *REA* 32 (1930), 339ff.

——, 'La matrone d'Ephèse dans Pétrone et dans Phèdre', *BAGB* 14 (1927), 20ff.

——, 'Le *Culex* et les débuts de Lucain', *Misc. J. Gessner* I (1948), 602ff.

——, 'Le date du Festin de Trimalchion', *AC* 11 (1942), 87ff.

HIGHET, G., 'Petronius the Moralist', *TAPA* 72 (1941), 176ff.

HILGENFELD, H., 'De L. Annaei Senecae epistulis moralibus', *FleckeisenJ Supp.* 17 (1890), 601ff.

HILTBRUNNER, O., *Latina graeca* (1958).

HOSIUS, C., 'Lucanus u. Seneca', *FleckeisenJ* 145 (1892), 337ff.

——, 'Lucan u. seine Quellen', *RhM* 48 (1893), 380ff.

HUBEAUX, J., in *REL* 16 (1938), 243f.

IANELLI, C., *In Perottinum codicem diss. tertia* (1811).

IGNARRA, N., *De palaestra Neapolitana* (1770)

VAN IJZEREN, J., 'Neros inneming van Troje', *Hermen.* 25 (1954), 115ff.

JONAS, F., *De ordine librorum Senecae* (1870).

KELLER, O., in *FleckeisenJ* 89 (1864) 503f.

KEMPE, P., *De clausulis petronianis* (1922).

KINDT, B., 'Petron u. Lucan', *Phil.n.f.* 5 (1892), 255ff.

KLEBS, E., 'Petroniana', *Phil. Supp.* (1893), 661ff.

——, 'Zur Komposition v. Petronius *Satirae*', *Phil. n. f.* 1 (1889), 623ff.

KRAFFERT, H., *Neue Beiträge z. Kritik u. Erklärung lateinischen Autoren* (1888), 8ff.

KROLL, W., in *RE* XIX, 1202ff.

KUSCH, A., *De saturae romanae hexametro* (1915), 17ff.

LAKE, A. K., 'A Note on the Locality of the *Cena Trimalchionis*', *AJP* 62 (1941), 494.

LEEMAN, A.D., 'The epistolary form of Seneca, *Ep.* 102.', *Mn.* 4 (1951), 175ff.

LEHMANN, H., *Claudius u. Nero u. Ihre Zeit* (1858), 16f.

LIPSIUS, JUSTUS (Joost Lips), Edition of 1672, preface to the *Epp.*

LEOPOLD, J. H., *Over de Plaats van Handeling der Cena Trimalchionis* (1896).

LÖHR, F., 'Petrons Lebensende', *JOEAI* 11 (1908), 165ff.

MAASS, E., 'Apelles u. Protogenes', *JOEAI* 11 (1908), 28ff.

MAIURI, A., 'Petroniana', *PP* 3 (1948), 101ff.

MALCOVATI, E., *Marco Anneo Lucano* (1940).

——, 'Sul prologo della *Farsaglia*', *Athen.* 29 (1951), 100ff.

MARBACH, A., *Wortbilding, Wortwahl u. Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron* (1931).

MARCHESI, C., *Seneca* (1944), 209ff.

MARGARITORI, M., *Petronio Arbitro—ricerche biographiche* (1897).

MARMORALE, E. V., *Petronio* (1936).

——, *Petronio nel suo tempo* (1937).

——, *La questione petroniana* (1948).

——, 'Petronio visse fra Commode ed Elagabalo', *GIF* 2 (1949), 361ff.

MARTENS, A., *de L. Annaei Senecae vita*, &c. (1871), 49ff.

MARTI, B. M., 'The Meaning of the *Pharsalia*', *AJP* 66 (1945), 352ff.

MARTINS, F., 'A crise do maravilhoso na epopeia latina', *Humanitas* 1 (1947), 25ff.

MARX, F., s.v. *Lucan*, in *RE* I (1894), 2227ff.

McGann, M. J., 'The Authenticity of Lucan, fr. 12M', *CQ* 51 (1957), 126ff.
Misner, B., 'La defese di Eumolpo', *EPhK* 62 (1938), 99ff.
Mitchell, J. M., *Petronius, Leader of Fashion* (1922), introd.
von Morawski, C., 'Petroniana', *Eos* 1 (1894), 1ff.
Momigliano, A., 'Literary chronology of the Neronian Age', *CQ* 38 (1944), 96ff.
Mommsen, T., 'Trimalchios Heimath u. Grabschrift', *H* 13 (1878), 106ff.
Monti, A., *Nuovi studi petroniani* I (1907).
Mossler, J. G., *Commentatio de Petronii poemate de bello civili* (1842).
——, *Quaestionum petronianarum specimen* (1856).
Münscher, J., 'Senecas Werke', *Phil. Supp.* 16 (1922), I.
Mutschemann, H., 'Seneca u. Epikur', *H* 1 (1915), 321ff.
Nelson, H. W. L., *Petronius en zijn Vulgair Latijn* (1947).
Niebuhr, B. G., *Kleine historische Schriften* (1828), 337ff.
Nissen, H., *Italische Landeskunde* II^2 (1902), 737ff.
——, in *WKPh* 1908, col. 1398.
Nock, A.D., 'The Proem of Lucan', *CR* 40 (1926), 17f.
Paoli, U. E., 'De manumissione per mensam', *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 2 (1936), 369ff.
——, 'Ancora sull' età del *Satyricon*', *RIFC* 16 (1938), 13ff.
——, 'L'età del *Satyricon*', *SIFC* 14 (1937), 43f.
Paraf, P., *Petrone et les nouveaux-riches* (1919).
Paratore, E., 'Petronio nel terzo secolo?', *Paid* 3 (1948), 261ff.
——, 'Una nuova edizione della *Cena Trimalchionis*', *Maia* 1 (1948), 129ff.
——, *Una nuova ricostruzione del de poetis di Suetonio*^{2} (1950).
Pascal, C., *Epicurei e mistici* (1911), 13ff.
Paul, L., 'Die Vergöttung Neros durch Lucanus', *FleckeisenJ.* 149 (1894), 409ff.
Pavan, M., 'L'ideale politico di Lucano', *AIV* 113 (1955), 209ff.
Peiper, R., *Praefatio in Senecae trag. supplementum* (1870), 14ff.
Pepe, L., *Studi petroniani* (1957).
——, 'Petronio conosce l'epistolario di Plinio', *GIF* 11 (1958), 289f.
Peter, H., 'Der Brief in d. röm. Literatur', *AKSGW* 47 (1901), III.
di Petra, G., 'Napoli colonia romana', *AAN* 16 (1892), 57ff.
Peligersdorffer, G., 'Lucan als Dichter der geistigen Widerstandes', *H* 87 (1959), 344ff.
Pichon, R., *Les sources de Lucain* (1912).
——, in *JS* (1912), 222ff.
de Plinval, G., 'Une insolence de Lucain', *Laton.* 15 (1956), 512ff.
Pugliese Carratelli, G., 'Tabulae ceratae Herculanenses', *PP* 1 (1946), 373ff; 3 (1948), 165ff.
Puntoni, A., 'La composizione del poema lucaneo', *RAL* 8.2 (1947), 101ff.
Raith, O., *Petronius ein Epikureer* (1963).
Rankin, H. D., 'On Tacitus' Biography of Petronius', *C & M* 26 (1965), 233ff.
Révay, J., *Petronius és Kora* (1927).
Révay, J., 'Contributo alla questione della parodia di Nerone in Petronio', *RIGI* 7 (1923), 29ff.
Ritter, F. 'Zwei Werke des Petronius Arbiter', *RhM* 2 (1843), 561ff.
Roncaioli, C., 'Il diminutive e l'età di Petronio', *GIF* 14 (1961), 1ff.
van Rooy, C. A., *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (1965).
Rose, K.F.C., 'The Author of the *Satyricon*', *Latomus* 20 (1961), 821-825.

——, 'The Date of the *Satyricon*', *CQ* n.s. 12 (1962), 166ff.
——, 'Time and Place in the *Satyricon*', *TAPA* 93 (1962), 402ff.
——, 'Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career', *TAPA* 97 (1966), 379ff.
——, 'The Petronian Inquisition: An Auto-da-Fé', *Arion* 5(1966), 275ff.
ROSSBACH, O., s.v. *Seneca*, in *RE* I (1894), 2246.
ROSTAGNI, A., *Suetonio de poetis* (1944).
ROSTOVTZEFF, M., *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*² (1957).
ROWELL, H. T., 'The Gladiator Petraites and the Date of the *Satyricon*', *TAPA* 89 (1958), 14ff.
DE SALAS, J. A. G., *Praeludia et commenta*, see Burman's editions
SALONIUS, A. H., 'Die Griechen u. das Griechische in Petrons *Cena Trimalchionis*', *Comm. S. S. Fennicae* 2 (1927), 5ff.
SANDFORD, E. M., 'The Eastern Question in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*', *Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand* (1938), 255ff.
SCHEFFER, J., See Burman's editions.
SCHNUR, H.C., *The Age of Petronius Arbiter* (1957).
——, 'The Economic Background of the *Satyricon*', *Latom.* 18 (1959), 790ff.
——, '*vitiorum imitatio*—Tacitus on Petronius', *CJ* 52 (1955), 353-354.
SCHÖNBERGER, O., 'Z. Komposition des Lucan', *H* 85 (1957), 251ff.
——, 'Z. Komposition des Lucan—ein Nachtrag', *H* 86 (1958), 230ff.
——, *Untersuchung. z. Widerholungstechnik Lucans* (1961).
SCHULTESS, F., *De Senecae N.Q. et Epistulis* (1872).
——, Rev. of Hilgenfeld, *BPhW* 1893, col. 524.
——, Rev. of Binder, *PBhW* 1906, col. 324.
SEGUINO, G., in *Memorie lette nell' Acad. Ercolanese* (1861), 20ff.
SGOBBO, I., 'La città campana delle *Saturae* di Petronio', *RAL* 31 (1922), 354ff, 395ff.
SINGELS, N., *De Lucani fontibus et fide* (1884).
SOGLIANO, A., 'Miscellanea epigraphica napoletana', *ASPN* 18(1893), 769-783, 19 (1894), 164ff., 550ff; 20 (1895) 95ff., 770ff; 21 (1896), 170ff.
SOURIAU, M., *De deorum ministeriis in Pharsalia* (1885).
SPOTO, S., *L'identificazione di Petronio* (1948).
STAMPINI, E., '*Ambages* in Petronio e in Dante', *RFC* 48 (1920), 385ff.
STATILEO, M., *Responsio* &c., see Burman's editions.
——, *Apologia*, &c., see Burman's editions.
STEELE, R. B., 'Literary Adaptations and References in Petronius', *CJ* 15 (1920), 279ff.
——, 'Lucan's *Pharsalia*', *AJP* 45 (1924), 301ff.
STUBBE, H., 'Die Verseinlagen in Petron', *Phil. Supp.* 25 (1933).
STUDER, G., 'Über das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbiter', *RhM n.f.* 2 (1843), 50ff, 202ff.
SULLIVAN, J. P., *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study* (1968).
——, 'Petronius, Lucan and Seneca: A Neronian Literary Feud?', *TAPA* 100 (1969), 453-467
SÜSS, W., 'De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari', *AUD* 9 (1926), iv.
——, 'Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum illius aetatis doctrina', *AUD* 13 (1928), 1.
SYNDIKUS, H. P., *Lucans Gedicht v. Bürgerkrieg* (1958), 27ff.
TERZAGHI, N., 'Ancora sull' età del *Satyricon*', *AFC* 4 (1947-9), 115ff.
TESCARI, O., *Storia della letteratura romana*⁴ (1946), 275.
TEUFFEL, W. S., 'Zu Petronius', *RhM* n.f. 4 (1846), 510ff. = *Studien u. Charakteristik*² (1889), 391ff.

THOMAS, E., *Pétrone, l'envers de la société romaine*³ (1912).

THOMAS, P., *L'âge et l'auteur de Satiricon* (1905).

TIRABOSCHI, G., *Storia della letteratura italiana*² (1823), 119ff.

TRAMPE, E., *De Lucani arte matrica* (1884).

TREVES, P., *Il mito di Allessandro e la Roma di Augusto* (1953), 87f.

UNTERSTEINER, M., 'I due Petronii', *A &R n.s.* 3 (1922), 252ff.

USSANI, V., 'Controversia lucanea', *RFC* 29 (1901), 50ff.

——, 'Quaestioni petroniane', *SIFC* 13 (1950), 1-51.

DE VALOIS, H. (Valesius), *Dissertatio,* etc, see Burman's editions.

DE LA VILLE de MIRMONT, H., 'Lucain et Pétrone', *RU* 2.1 (1893), 157ff., 417ff.

VILLE, G., 'Les coupes de Trimalchion figurant des gladiateurs et une serie de verres sigillés gaulois', *Hommages à J. Bayet, Collection Latomus* 70 (1964), 722-733.

VEYNE, P., 'Vie de Trimalchion', *Annales, Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 16 (1961), 213ff.

——, 'Trimalchio Maecenatianus', *Hommages à A. Grenier, Collection Latomus* 58 (1962), 1617-1624.

VITELLI, C., 'Sulla composizione e pubblicazione della *Farsaglia*', *SIFC* 8 (1900), 33ff.

WAGENSEIL, J. C., *Dissertatio* etc., see Burman's editions.

WEBER, C. F., 'Vitae M. Annaei Lucani collectae', *Ind. Lect. Marburg*, 1-2 (1856-7).

——, *de duplici Pharsaliae lucaneae exordio* (1860).

WESTERBURG, E., 'Petron u. Lucan', *RhM* 38 (1883), 92ff.

WIEGAND, T., in *FleckeisenJ Supp.* 20 (1894), 677.

WITKE, CH., *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion* (1970).

VAN WOUWEREN, J., see Burman's editions.

INDEXES

INDEX OF PETRONIAN PASSAGES

1.1 82
2.7 15
2.9 17
5.1 14
5.7-8 76, 82
19.6 93
20.1 82
23. 14, 41
25.7 82
26.7-78.8 (*Cena*) 3, 6, 7, 22n, 42, 78
26-30 11
27.2 78, 82
28.2 83
.3 83
.4 78, 83
.8 78. 83
.9 28, 78
29.1-6 28, 88
.7 78
.8 83
.9 24, 83
30.2 22, 78, 83
.3 83
.4 78, 83
.11 78, 83
31.3 83
.5 83
.7 83
.8 83
.11 83
32.1-2 82, 83
.3 19, 34
.4 78, 83
33.2 83
34.6-7 22
.10 40 n
35.4 23
.6 83
.7 84
36. 78
.3 84
.5 78, 84
.6 24, 78, 84
37.2 84
.9 32
38.5 83
.8-11 84, 85, 86
.10 28
39.2 84
.4 84
40.5 29
44.9 16
45.4-8 32
.7 20, 27
.8 35
.11 84
47.4-6 26
.11 73
48.2-3 32
.4 73
50.4-5 73, 83
51. 25
52.1 84
.2 84
.3 21
.9 73, 84
53.2 27
.3 25, 34, 78
.5-6 22
.10 78, 84
54.1 78, 84
55. 41
.5 73
.6.1 93
56.3 84
.7 73
57.4 19, 26, 33
58.2 20
.10 19
59.2-3 78, 83
60.1-3 84
.7 25, 26
64.4 21
65.10 20
66.1 73
.7 84
67.6 85
68.1-2 29, 78, 85
.3 83
.8 30
70.8 24, 43
.10-11 15 n
.11-71.7 73
71.1 32
.2 20, 85
.6 21
.9 34
.11 85
.12 22, 30, 78, 85
72.3 85
73.3 21
.6 85
74.1-3 85
.13 84, 85
75.2 25, 78
76.2 28
.3-8 31
.8 22 n
.10 73, 85
77.3 32
.4 84
.5 23
78. 44
.5 73, 78, 83
.6 85
.7 29
79.1 85
.9 19
80.3 85
81.1 17
.2 85
82.2 85
.5 85
83.1 76
.8 85, 86
84.5 72
86.4 86
88.2 87
.8 75, 86
.9 86
89. 41, 75
.1 86
90.4 86
93.2.4 14
.2.5-6 93
97-100 12
99.1 86
.5 29
102.3 12
.14 27, 28

.15 29
104.3 40 n
107.4 19
108.14 93, 94
109.1 86
.9-10 76, 86
110.2 86
111-3 86
111.2 29
116.2 27
.3 27
.9 73
117.1-10 86
.8 32
.12 61
.13 62, 67
118. 16, 17, 64, 67, 73, 74, 87
119-24 (*Bellum Civile*) 5, 9, 17, 41, 61, 63, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 76, 80, 86, 87, 88
lines 1-2 65, 88, 92
lines 6ff 74 n, 88, 92
line 7 92
line 10 74 n
lines 14-16 88, 92, 93
line 16 74 n, 86
line 17 86
line 18 74 n
lines 19ff 33, 93
lines 20-6 86, 92
lines 24ff 74 n
lines 26-7 88, 92
lines 27-31 92, 93
line 28 74 n
line 29 86
lines 31-3 92
lines 34-5 74 n
line 36 89
line 37 92
lines 39-52 89, 92
line 45 74 n
line 46 80, 92
lines 49-50 89, 93
lines 54-5 89, 93
line 56 92
line 57 92
lines 58-60 74 n, 92
lines 61-6 89, 92
lines 65-7 74 n
lines 67-78 88
lines 74-5 92
lines 79-81 92, 93
lines 80-5 92
lines 82-7 80, 92
lines 85-7 88, 92
lines 87ff 86
lines 87-8 74 n
lines 89 93
lines 90-95 88
line 92 92
line 93 92
lines 96-9 89, 92, 93
lines 100-10 88, 92
lines 111-5 89, 90, 92, 93
lines 116-25 88, 90, 92
lines 126-7 90, 92
line 128 90
lines 130-9 92
lines 141-2 90, 93
lines 144-5 93
line 148 92, 93
lines 152-4 90, 92
lines 156-76 88, 92, 93
line 160 90
lines 161-9 92, 93
lines 170-3 92, 93
lines 174-5 90, 92
line 180 93
line 181 93
lines 187-9 92
line 191 92
line 203 92
line 206 93
lines 207-8 92
lines 210-4 92
lines 216-8 90, 92
lines 216-20 92
lines 224-5 92
lines 226-32 90, 92
lines 233-6 91
lines 233-7 92
lines 238-9 92
lines 241-2 92, 93
lines 245-63 88, 92, 93
lines 262-3 91
lines 264-94 88, 91, 92, 93
line 277 90, 91
lines 279-81 92
line 282 92
line 284 91
line 286 93
lines 288-9 92
lines 290-4 65, 91, 92
124.2ff (*Croton*) 32, 61
126.7 76
127.7 20
128. 25, 75
.6 40 n, 43
132.15 13, 14, 40, 41
135.8.1-3 93, 94
.8.6 86
136.4ff 86
140.2.7 72
.7 72, 86
141. 94
.2 77, 86

FRAGMENTS

fr. 9 56
fr. 15 56
fr. 18 (Ernout) 23
fr. 25-27 40 n
fr. 28 86
fr. 30 40 n
fr. 37 28

GENERAL INDEX *

Acte 84
Aemilius Scaurus, *see* Scaurus
Afranius 1-2
Africa 32
Agrippina 84
Albinus the Emperor 19
Albucia 4
Alexander Severus 20, 27
Annaeus Cornutus, *see* Cornutus
antescholanus (*vel antescholarius*) 17
Antistius Vetus 67
Antonines 8, 10, 15, 18, 19, 27, 31, 34
Apelles *cantor* 21, 76
Apelles *pictor* 76
Apocolocyntosis 13, 27, 36, 83
Apuleius 14, 19, 61
aqua nivata 83
Arbiter (as *cognomen*) 38, 44-45, *see also* Petronius Arbiter
armilla aurea 43, 78, 83
Asianism 15, 16
Asiaticus 80
Atticism 15, 56
Augustiani 76, 77
Augustus IX, 8, 25, 26, 39, 78, 79
Aurelius, Marcus 14, 61
Ausonius 28

Baiae 59, 78, 84
beards 29
Bellum Civile (*BC*) 17, 33, 60-68, 76, 80, 86, 87-94; (*date of composition*) 68, 76; (*purpose*) 62-63.
Bithynia 36, 56, 58
buried treasure, *see* Caesellius Bassus
Burrus 56, 58

Caesellius Bassus 9, 25, 43, 68, 75, 84, 85
Calpurnius Siculus 39
Calvisius Sabinus 73, 79
Campania 11, 31, 42, 58
cannibalism 76-77, 86
captatio 27, 32, 73-74
carmina Einsiedelnsia 39, 86
Carpus 21, 78, 84
carving to music 24
castration, laws against 33, 86
Cato the Elder 14, 40
Cato the Younger 40, 61-68 (*passim*)
Cena Trimalchionis 7, 10, 12, 21-33 (*passim*), 75-86 (*passim*)
Cicero 11, 13, 15, 16, 28
Claudius the Emperor 8, 26, 27, 78
Claudius Pallas, *see* Pallas
clausulae 14
Cluvius Rufus 48, 49, 54
codex Traguriensis 7, 12
"*codicilli*" view 7, 77
coloni 32
competition for office 32
Commodus the Emperor 18
Constantine the Emperor 7
Constitutio Antoniniana 19, 33
Cornutus 67
coronae 85
cosmianum, Cosmus 23
Croton 11, 19, 27, 32
crucifixion of slaves 34
Cumae 26, 55, 57
Cumanum praedium 22
cursores 78, 83

damnatio ad bestias 35, 36
decocta Neronis, see *aqua nivata*
dediticii 19
Dictys Cretensis 84
Dido, *see* Caesellius Bassus
Digest 35
Dio Cassius 21, 25, 26, 36, 42, 48, 66, 67, 75, 85
Diogenes the Cynic 85
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 16
Domitian the Emperor 6, 8, 15, 31, 33, 81

---

* [This index naturally makes no pretence of completeness. In a study of this sort, a full index would be intolerably long. The entries are intended to provide guidance through the arguments for the authorship and dating of the Satyricon, although some standard references have been added.]

Domus Aurea 76, 86
Dorotheus 76

Edictum de flatu 26
Ennius 93
Epicureanism 39, 40, 86
Epidamnus 65, 88, 91
Epistulae Morales 69-74, *see* Seneca the Younger
Eprius Marcellus 58
essedarii 20, 27, 33
Eutropius 83

false quantity 14
Fire of Rome 9, 66, 70, 71, 76
Flavians 15, 22, 32, 36
Flavius Scaevinus, *see* Scaevinus
Fronto 14, 16, 61, 62
Fulgentius 3, 4, 5

Gaius the Emperor 21, 31, 81
Gallienus the Emperor 6
glass, unbreakable, 25
gold rings 19, 26, 34
Golden House, see *Domus Aurea*
graecus mos 29
Granius Licinianus 62

Hadrian the Emperor 31, 32, 33, 34, 35
halosis, see *Troiae halosis*
Halotus 57
Heiric of Auxerre 2
Heliogabalus the Emperor 18
Herculaneum 50
Hermeros *gladiator* 21
Hieronymus, *see* Jerome
Historia Augusta, see *SHA*
Horace 18, 26, 38
horti Pompeiani 21, 22
Hyginus 85

imitatio vitiorum 46, 56-57
Imperial cult 25, 26, 78
inauditus mos 24
ingenuitas 19, 34
Isidorus the Cynic 85
Isidorus of Seville 4, 16, 25

Jerome, St., 5
Jews 24, 28
Johannes Lydus 4, 6
John of Salisbury 25
Julian the Emperor 6
Julio-Claudians 25, 57, 79
Julius Caesar 27, 61-68 (*passim*), 87-94 (*passim*)
ius anuli aurei 19, 26, 34
Juvenal 16, 23, 24, 42, 47, 48, 70, 83, 86; (*scholiast*) 47, 48, 86

Lactantius 4, 5, 6
Laenas 24
latifundia 32
Laus Pisonis 39
lexicon Floriacense 3
lex Fufia Caninia 33
lex Petronia de servis 35-37
Livy 27, 63
Locusta 23, 80
Lucan X, 1, 5, 9, 13, 16, 40, 44, 60-68, 75, 87-94; (*date of the Pharsalia*) 66-67; (*imitated by Petronius*) 60-68, 87-94
Lucian 29
Lucilius junior 72
Lucretius 5, 41, 93
Ludus de morte Caesaris, see *Apocolocyntosis*
Lugdunum 71

Macrobius 4
Maecenas 22, 26, 39, 40, 79
Maecenatianus 21, 22, 79
Malchio 51
Manilius 1
Q. Manlius Ancharius Torquatus Saturninus 50, 57
manumissio per mensam 15
Marius Victorinus 1, 2, 4
Martial 5, 6, 16, 22, 23, 39, 44, 61, 83, 84
Massilia 55
Maximus Scaurus, *see* Scaurus
Menecrates 21, 77
Messal(l)ina, Valeria 42
Midas 86
Mithridates 25, 34

Nauplius 84, 85
Neoptolemus of Parium 17
Nero IX, X, 1, 6, 18, 20, 24-26, 29, 30, 38-50 (*passim*), 73-79, 82-86. and *passim*

Neronia 9, 58
Nerva the Emperor 36

C. Octavius Laenas, *see* Laenas
Ofonius Tigellinus, *see* Tigellinus
Opimianum 22-23
Otho the Emperor 24, 43, 56

Pacuvius 73, 79
painting 17, 28
Palamedes 84-85
Pallas 26
Pannychis 80
pater patriae 25
Pedianus Secundus 35
Persius 16, 25, 28, 40, 86
Petrai(e)tes 21, 77
C. Petronius 45, 47-49, 51
P. Petronius (1) 36
P. Petronius (2) 47, 48
Petronius Arbiter 1, 4-6, 36-37, 38-59
A. Petronius Lurco 36, 38, 50
T. Petronius Niger: (*author of the Satyricon*) X, 38; (*his career*) 36, 50, 54, 55-59; (*his cognomen*) 38, 44-45; (*his consulship*) 57-58; (*as courtier*) 45, 55; (*as critic*) 40-41, 56, 61-64, 75; (*his literary purpose*) 39; (*his praenomen*) 47-55; (*his realism*) 75, 81
P. Petronius Polianus 19
C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus 54, 55
Petronius Priscus 38, 50
P. Petronius Turpilianus 36, 38, 50, 58
C. Petronius Umbrinus 55
Petronius Volusianus 6
Phaedrus 5
Pharsalia 60-68, *see* Lucan; (*speed of composition*) 62; (*title*) 60; (*unfinished*) 67; (*date*) 65-69
pica varia 28
Pisonian conspiracy 66
Plautus 44
Pliny the Elder 22, 24, 25, 28, 32, 47, 48, 51, 52, 54, 55, 71, 76, 77, 83-86
Pliny the Younger 12, 26, 44
Plutarch 47-51, 54-55
poetae novelli 18
Pompeianus 22
Pompeii 17, 22, 43; (*earthquake*) 71; (*inscriptions*) 13, 32; (*paintings*) 17, 22, 28, 43
C. Pompeius 65, 83
Sex. Pompeius 79
Pomponius Sabinus 6
Pontia, *Petronii filia*, 47, 54
Poppaea Sabina 76, 77
prasina factio 79
procurator 43
Publilius Syrus 73
Puteoli 22, 28, 42-43, 70, 80
pyxis aurea 43, 78, 83

Quintilian 6, 16, 40, 62

Remmius Palaemon 80-81

Sallust 54, 63
Satyricon: (*audience*) 41-43, 50, 60, 69; (*language and style*) 7, 10-15, 75; (*length*) 2-4, 41; (*lost episodes*) 3-4; (*MS corruptions*) 7, 10, 14-15, 17; (*MS tradition*) 1-3, 6-7, 10, 15; (*moral character*) 13-14, 18-19, 41-43, 45-46, 87; (*precise date*) X, 1-33, 46, 47, 50, 57, 58, 60, 69, 74, 93-94; (*realism*) 7, 10, 11, 75; (*title*) 1-2. *See also* T. Petronius Niger.
Scaevinus 40
Serapa 73
Serapio 73
Servius 16, 62, 85
Seviri Augustales 78
Sextiles 27-28
SHA 18, 19, 20, 34, 84
Sidonius Apollinaris 4
simplicitas 13-14, 39, 40, 43-45, 56, 57
specularis (*lapis*) 29, 78, 85
Scaurus (1) Mamercus Aemilius (2) Umbricius 23, 24
sculpture 17
Second Sophistic 15, 16
Seneca the Elder 16
Seneca the Younger X, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 24, 35, 38, 39, 40, 58, 60, 61, 69-74, 75, 80, 84, 91; see also *Apocolocyntosis*
Sporus 57, 82
Statius 5, 66
Stoicism 39, 40, 42, 44, 60, 61, 69, 72

Suetonius 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36, 42, 48, 62, 67, 77, 80, 81, 82-86
Syrus, *see* Publilius Syrus

Tacitus IX, 6, 16, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 66, 67, 70, 77, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86
Terentianus Maurus 4, 6, 17, 18
Tetraites, *see* Petraites
Tiberius the Emperor 25
Tigellinus 57, 79
Tiridates 58
Trau MS, see *codex Traguriensis*
treasure, *see* Caesellius Bassus
tributarius 33
Trimalchio *passim*
Troiae Halosis 75, 77, 86
C. Turannius (73), 79

Umbricius Scaurus, *see* Scaurus
unbreakable glass 25

Vacca 66
Vatinius 43, 57, 80
Velleius Paterculus 5
Vergil 1, 2, 39, 91
Vespasian the Emperor 22
vicesima hereditatum 20, 33
Victorinus, Marius 1, 2, 4
vigiles 29
Vipsanius Laenas, *see* Laenas
Vitellius the Emperor 80
vitiorum imitatio, see *imitatio*
vulgar Latin 10-15

wine-trade 31